

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o XXXVI. JULY 1884.

ART. I.—THE ENGLISH REFORMATION AND
THE STUDY OF GREEK.

1. *Epistolarum Libri XXXI.* ERASMUS. Folio. (London, 1642.)
2. *Epistolarum Libri IV.* R. ASCHAM. 8vo. (Oxon., 1703.)
3. *The Church History of Britain.* Folio. THOMAS FULLER. (London, 1655.)
4. *History of the University of Cambridge.* Folio. THOMAS FULLER. (Cambridge, 1655.)
5. *History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford.* ANTHONY À WOOD. 2 vols. 4to. (Oxford, 1792–1796.)
6. *Athenæ Oxonienses.* ANTHONY À WOOD. 4to. (London, 1813–1820.)
7. *History of English Poetry.* THOMAS WARTON. 4 vols. 8vo. (London, 1871.)
8. *Introduction to the Literature of Europe.* H. HALLAM. 4 vols. 8vo. (London, 1855.)
9. *The University of Cambridge.* JAMES BASS MULLINGER. 8vo. (Cambridge, 1873.)

THROUGHOUT the unceasing dispute carried on in this country and in France as to the merits of classical education, Greek has borne the chief brunt of assault. It has always been a luxury of learning, and it is not too much to affirm that, at any rate up to the end of the sixteenth century, the progress of Greek scholarship in England is a measure and criterion of the general culture of the country. The neighbourhood of a great Romance people, the allegiance to the See of Rome, and the consequent general acceptance of the language of the ecclesiastical world for ordinary diplomatic

VOL. XVIII.—NO. XXXVI.

S

intercourse, rendered Latin a necessity of every-day life. Before the coming of Augustine (A.D. 597) even Latin, it is thought by Dean Milman, had passed into oblivion. The mission from Rome not only put an end to this linguistic isolation, but through the intimate connexion then subsisting between Rome and Constantinople first introduced into England strangers of Eastern races speaking the Greek tongue.

The diadoche of early Greek scholars, of whom Wilfrid, Erigena, and Roger Bacon are the most familiar names, was but a broken and fitful succession. It was not until the industry of the Greek refugees in Italy had attracted attention to Greek literature that English students were found to brave the hazards of mediæval travel, and to seek learning at the fountain-head. Leland enumerates a band of English scholars in Italy in the fifteenth century, of whom not the least notable was Flemming, the bitter adversary of the fifteenth-century Reformers, who founded Lincoln College for a pillar of orthodoxy. In emulation of these examples, William Sellynge or Selling, Fellow of All Souls, became in 1480 a student of Greek at Bologna. It is Selling who, by his introduction of Linacre to Politian, forms the link between Flemming, on the one hand, and the better known Oxford Reformers and Greek scholars of the sixteenth century, Grocyn and More, on the other. Selling brought with him to Canterbury and presented to the monastery of Christ Church, of which he became prior, a treasure of Greek and Latin MSS. His tomb still exists in Canterbury Cathedral, with the epitaph:—

‘ Doctor theologus Selling Græcâ atque Latinâ
Lingûâ perdoctus.’

With him we enter upon the period in which the old learning began to be sensible of its threatened supersession by classical studies pursued in a secular spirit, while the youthful enthusiasm of a new generation was stirred at the prospect of exploring a literature which had for so many ages been almost buried and forgotten.

From this time we have a succession of students at Oxford travelling to Greece or Italy to complete their studies in Greek. Thus Lilly, generally known as Lilly the Grammarian, sometime Demy of Magdalen College, Oxford, after perfecting his Latin in Italy, settled for some years in Rhodes in order to learn Greek.¹ He is mentioned with other

¹ Lilly's indefatigable pursuit of learning met, as it merited, with

scholars of like enterprise in some very indifferent verses of Leland :—

' Lumina doctrinæ Grocinus deinde secutus,
Sellingus, Linacer, Latimarusque prius ;
Dunstallus, Phoenix,¹ Stocleus atque Coletus,
Lilius et Pæceus, festa corona virum.
Omnes Italiam petierunt sidere fausto
Et nituit Latii Musa Britannia scholis,' &c.²

The eulogistic tone of these lines may be contrasted with the satire of the *Ship of Fools* in speaking of the same love of scholars for foreign travel (1508) :—

' One runneth to Almayne, another into France,
To Paris, Padway, Lombardy, or Spayne,
Another to Bonony, Rome or Orleauce,
To Cayns, to Thoulouse, Athens or Cologne,
And at the last returneth home again
More ignorant.'

The growth of the study of Greek at Oxford made the presence of a qualified public lecturer upon the language a felt necessity. There has been some dispute as to the first occupant of the chair, Knight and Jortin affirming that Linacre was appointed first, and was succeeded by Lupsett. Hallam, however, shows, from a tract by the learned Dr. Caius, joint founder of the college which bears his name at Cambridge, that one Calpurnius, a Greek, was appointed by Wolsey. The passage (translated) runs : ' The school of Oxford learned the manner of the real Greek pronunciation from Matthew Calpurnius, a Greek, whom for the sake of substantial recognition. On his return to England in 1511, Dean Colet, who was at that time engaged upon the foundation of S. Paul's School, anxious that ' the children of Paul's ' should be taught Greek, invited him to become the first High Master. The stipend offered was 35*l.* per annum, a little over one-fifth of the salary of the Lord Chancellor of England, which shows the high value set upon his attainments.

¹ Punctuated thus in Wood, with the comma after Dunstallus. ' Phoenix ' appears to be an epithet, though it is not easy to see its appropriateness to Tunstall. Latimarus is William Latymer, a Fellow of All Souls. Stocleus is Stokesley, sometime Principal of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and afterwards Bishop of London. Erasmus says of him, ' that ' in addition to his learning in scholastic theology, in which he gave place to none, he had an uncommon skill in three languages.' Some of the other names occurring in these lines will be noticed presently.

² It is to be observed that William Tyndale sometimes, but inaccurately, called ' the first translator of the New Testament into English,' does not appear in this list. He was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, where, however, it is doubtful whether he took his degree. He afterwards studied at Cambridge. His edition of the New Testament was published at Wittenberg in 1526 or 1527.

learning Thomas Wolsey had brought to Oxford all the way from Greece.' If this be the fact, Linacre and Lupsett must have been professors of rhetoric only, and not of Greek; but there seems to have been some sort of connexion between the two chairs, since we find John Clement afterwards advanced from the former to the latter. Linacre was, at any rate, thoroughly qualified as a professor of Greek. According to Wood (*Ath. Oxon.*) he had studied in Canterbury under Selling. He subsequently became the pupil at Florence both of Demetrius Chalcondylas, tutor to the children of Lorenzo de' Medici, and also of that scholar's illustrious rival, Politian. Returning from Italy he gave private instruction in Greek at Oxford, about the year 1498. At Oxford he translated *Proclus de Sphæra*, of which there were many MSS. in the University. A story in connexion with this work shows the suspicion with which men of the world at that date looked upon the pretension to a knowledge of Greek. Linacre dedicated his translation to the king, Henry VII.; but, notwithstanding that it was vouched for by Grocyn, a scholar of recognized authority, who wrote the preface, Henry was persuaded by Bernard Andreas, a blind poet afterwards satirized by Erasmus, that Linacre's translation was itself from a translation, of which in fact it was a reproduction. This 'so prejudiced the king against Linacre that he ever after abhorred him as an impostor.'¹ The same disposition to regard Greek as, if not an impossible, at least an improbable attainment, was not long afterwards exhibited in a quarter from which we should not have looked for it. In one of the letters of Erasmus he complains that the Bishop of Rochester did not believe that his translations from the New Testament were his own. The Bishop of Rochester was Fisher, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge.

The foundation by Wolsey of a public professorship of Greek at Oxford was an innovation which had been in some sort anticipated by Fox, Bishop of Winchester (1502-1530). Two years before the appointment of Calpurnius, Fox had, in 1517, instituted a Greek lectureship in his new College of Corpus Christi. Although, so far as is known, himself unacquainted with Greek, he drew up a list of the Greek authors who were to form the subject of the lectures. This consisted of those who are, as Warton has it, 'the purest and such as are most esteemed, even in the present improved state of ancient learning.'² But, in contrast with

¹ Jortin's *Erasmus*, i. 7.

² *Hist. Poet.* iv. 3.

the prescience of Colet and Fox, it is a remarkable circumstance that Wolsey himself, some years earlier, in drawing up the statutes of his intended foundation at Ipswich, which contained full details of the course of instruction, omitted all mention of Greek. That this omission was not rectified is the more inexplicable, inasmuch as Wolsey professed great attachment to liberal learning, and so far interested himself in the system of education, that he published an address to the schoolmasters of England upon the subject. He must also have been conversant with the curriculum at S. Paul's School, since we hear of his presence at the performance of a Latin tragedy at the school in the mastership of John Rightwise, who in 1522 succeeded Lilly.¹ Nor was it only at S. Paul's that schoolboys were taught Greek, as is shown by a letter written in 1554 by Sir Thomas Pope to Cardinal Pole, on the occasion of the foundation by the former of Trinity College, Oxford. In the statutes of Trinity, the founder had required lectures on certain specified Latin authors, adding, however, a general permission for the lecturer occasionally to substitute Greek. Having submitted these statutes to the Cardinal, who had himself studied for some time at Magdalen, we learn from him that prelate's opinion of them.

'My Lord Cardinal's Grace has had the overseeing of my statutes. He much lyketh well that I have therein ordered the Latin tongue to be read to my scholars. But he advyseth me to order the Greeke to be more taught there than I have provided. This purpose I well lyke, but I fear the tymes will not bear it now. I remember when I was a young scholler at Eton the Greeke tongue was growing apace, the study of which is now alate much decayed.'²

The most interesting of the earlier students of Greek at Oxford were those who formed the group of which Erasmus

¹ It must have been during this High Master's tenure of office (1522-32) that the boys of S. Paul's acquired the familiarity with Greek of which Erasmus speaks admiringly. 'Could you, for one, have believed that it would ever come to pass that in England or Holland boys should chatter Greek, and have a happy knack of rattling off Greek epigrams?'

² Warton's *Hist. Poet.* iv. 17. The time to which Pope refers was about 1520. It is plain, therefore, that Greek became part of the Eton course at a very early date. Pits says, of one William Horman, that he was 'sent to study at the College of Eton, and there drank eagerly of humane learning, and gathered the rudiments of the Greek tongue; on which Hallam justly remarks that, as Horman became head master of Eton in 1485, it is in the highest degree improbable that he was taught Greek at Eton when a boy. To this may be added the circumstance that in the Paston Letters, though William Paston writes from Eton in

and More were the centre, most of whose names are commemorated in the verses of Leland already quoted. Mention has already been made of Grocyn, who died in 1519, of Linacre and of Lilly. To these may be added Tunstall, who became an undergraduate of Balliol in 1491. While in residence he probably attended the lectures of Grocyn, afterwards completing his scholarship at Padua. William Latymer, Fellow of All Souls in 1489, and therefore slightly senior to Tunstall, was another student in Italy. The first English public professor of Greek in Oxford, John Clement, of Corpus, the successor to Calpurnius, is unaccountably omitted from Leland's list, but that he was a scholar of repute is evident from a passage in a letter of Sir Thomas More. 'My friend Clement lectures at Oxford to such an audience as was never before seen.'¹ Paice, of Queen's College, another of the Padua students, was, as Wood tells us, 'for opinion and fame of learning so generally accepted, not only here in England with Lynacre, Grocin, Sir Thomas More and others, but also known and reported abroad, in such manner, that in the great volume of Erasmus, his Epistles, he wrote almost to none so many as he wrote to this our author, Paice.'² Paice was also one of the most distinguished diplomatists of his time, and was entrusted by Cardinal Wolsey with the negotiations for that prelate's election to the Papacy. These, with some few more Oxford men, represented Greek scholarship in England, in the period just preceding the Reformation, and small though their numbers are, England, according to the testimony of Erasmus, stood in the esteem of the learned second only to Italy.

Sir Thomas Pope had just grounds for saying that the reign of Mary was unfavourable to the study of Greek. The ultra-orthodox clergy had, from the outset, vehemently opposed it, and when in power were likely to enforce their views. Even Bishop Fox was obliged to vindicate his foundation of a Greek lecture by a reference to a canonical decree of the year 1311 promulgated by Clement V. at Vienne, which enacted that professors of Hebrew, Greek, and Arabic should be instituted in the Universities of Oxford, Paris, Bologna, Salamanca and Rome. It is, however, a significant fact, whether within the knowledge of Fox or not, that this

1468 and gives specimens of his proficiency in Latin, nothing is said about Greek.

¹ Wood's *Hist. and Ant. of the University of Oxford*, Bk. II. sub 'Lectures.'

² Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, sub 'Paice.'

provision had, as regards Greek, been withdrawn some time in the fourteenth century. It was asserted by the obstructives, when attention was called to the canon, that Greek had never been included in the original draft of Pope Clement's epistle. Erasmus, speaking of this controversy in a letter to Christopher Fisher, queries, 'I wonder by what device they can have shuffled out of the Greek.' Of course it was to the interest of those who had been engaged in teaching the antiquated "trivium" and "quadrivium" of scholasticism that the course of study should not be entirely changed. But, quite apart from selfish and personal motives, some serious persons had perceived that the effect of classical studies upon the scholars of Italy had been the creation of a pagan, and even anti-Christian, sentiment of a type with which readers of George Eliot will be familiar in the character of Bardo in *Romola*. These mingled sources of antipathy to the new learning accordingly united many in resistance to its intrusion, and it is not surprising to hear that, as Erasmus tells us, the Oxford priests in the confessional admonished young scholars, 'Beware lest the Greeks make a heretic of you,' while the mendicant friars of the University introduced the word 'Greekling' as a sarcastic synonym for heretic. The same feeling had found expression in France, and a French writer tells us that 'la première faculté de théologie et de la chrétienté, la Sorbonne, osait dire devant le Parlement que c'en était fait de la religion si on permettrait l'étude du Grec et de l'Hébreu.'¹ Nor did this suspicion of the new learning remain confined to the clergy. It is said, and may well be believed, that the dread of his imbibing heresy through Greek prompted Sir Thomas More's father to remove his son from Oxford.²

Thomas More was but seventeen when Erasmus, in 1497, came to Oxford to study Greek under Grocyn and Linacre, More's own tutors. An enthusiastic letter of Erasmus paints the attractions of this interesting circle:—

'As I listen to my friend Colet, I seem to be listening to Plato in person. Who can fail to admire in Grocyn his complete cycle of attainments? What is more pungent than the criticism of Linacre? what more profound? what more finished? What has nature

¹ Laurent. *Hist. du Droit des Gens*, tom. viii. p. 392, quoted by Mullinger, *Hist. Univ. Camb.* p. 525.

² Drummond's *Erasmus* i. 69. But Stapleton in his *Tres Thomæ*, alleges a different reason. 'His father left him without any means for the study of Greek and of Philosophy, so as to compel him to the study of Law.'

ever fashioned more flexible, pleasanter, or more felicitous than the wit of Thomas More?'¹

But, despite the eminence of the favourers of the new learning at Oxford, the conservative party kept no bounds to their animosity. In 1519, when Henry VIII. happened to be at the royal manor of Woodstock, adjacent to Oxford, his attention was called by Paice and More to the attacks upon the students of Greek, urged, with the authority which such a position conferred, from the pulpit of the University Church. The king, who delighted to pose as a patron of learning, admonished the offenders by a severe reprimand. More himself, probably on the same occasion, addressed to the University an epistle of searching satire. After ridiculing the denunciations of the orthodox party, whose riotous supporters among the undergraduates had assumed the name of 'Trojans,' he argues in favour of Greek that the New Testament was written in that language, and that 'the most skillful expounders of Holy Writ were Greeks;' and then adds, with seeming gravity, 'This I can truly say with the assent of all learned men:' an indication of his estimate of the erudition of his correspondents.²

Another episode described by Erasmus helps to illustrate the obstinacy and ignorance of the party of the old learning:

'A certain divine preaching at court before the king began to rave against Greek learning and new interpreters (of the Scriptures) with equal impudence and stupidity. Paice threw a glance at the king, watching to see with what mien he would listen to this. The king presently smiled pleasantly at Paice. When the sermon was finished, he bade the theologian approach, and to More was assigned the task of defending the Greek learning. The king deigned to be present at the dispute. After More had with the greatest fluency advanced many arguments, and the answer of the divine was looked for, he fell on his knees and simply implored pardon, at the same time extenuating his misconduct by saying that while preaching he received inspiration from some spirit and so launched out against the Greek language. The spirit, replied the king, was not of Christ, but a spirit of foolishness.'³

The theologian subsequently explained that his animosity against Greek was disarmed by the reflection that it was derived from Hebrew. Henry dismissed him, 'in wonder at

¹ A letter to Robert Fisher in Italy, written by Erasmus from London in December 1497.

² The letter, which is very long, is given in the appendix to Jortin's *Erasmus*.

³ Erasmus Rot. Petro Mosellano. Louvain, 1519.

the fellow's outrageous folly,' with the injunction not to reappear as a preacher at court.

Erasmus remained at Oxford a little over a year (1498-1500) and left, despite the entreaties of Colet that he would remain, with the hope of prosecuting his studies in Italy. His second visit to England, after an interval of five years of literary diligence, was at the beginning of 1505. It was on this occasion that he paid his first visit to Cambridge.

Very different pictures are drawn by the rival academical historians of the state of learning at this time in their respective Universities. Wood, with somewhat of an excess of laudable zeal, speaks of Cambridge as 'overspread with barbarism.'

'From Oxford,' he says, 'Erasmus went to Cambridge, where at first he found the scholars far worse than at Oxford. He read there the Greek Grammar of Chrysoloras, but very few or none would bestow the pains to be his auditors. When he had made a comedy or tragedy which he entitled *Icaromenippus*, there was none of that University could, or at least would, write it out, and, therefore, he, with great complaints, sent it to Andrew Ammonius¹ to have it transcribed. . . . As the changing of an old custom, however necessary the change be and profitable, in the beginning most commonly proveth full of difficulty. . . . so in the University of Cambridge far more than in Oxford. No one thing was so unwillingly received and more opposed by that gang who endeavoured that ignorance might take place than that admirable light to the clearing of error and mistake, the Greek text of the New Testament first published in print by the said Erasmus. And yet nevertheless it was appointed (as he saith) under a great mulct in a certain college in Cambridge that no Fellow thereof should be so vile and impious as to bring it within the gates.'

On the other hand, Fuller, as might be anticipated, quotes with great gusto the celebrated letter of Erasmus describing the two Universities.

'England,' saith he, 'hath two most noble² Universities, Cambridge and Oxford; in both of these the Greek tongue is taught, but in Cambridge quietly, because John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, sits governor of the school, not only for his learning's sake, but for his divine life. But when a certain young man at Oxford, not meanly learned, did happily enough profess the Greek tongue there, a barbarous Fellow in a popular sermon began to rail against the Greek tongue with great and hainous revilings.'³

Unquestionably there is much exaggeration in Wood's account of Cambridge at this time, especially in his statement

¹ Ammonius of Lucca. See next page.

² In the original the phrase is *haudquaquam incelebres*.

Fuller's *Hist. Univ. Camb.*, § 5, 54.

that 'all things were full of rudeness and barbarousness.' Nevertheless it is certain that Erasmus, even if protected by Bishop Fisher against external manifestations of resentment, such as were displayed at Oxford, missed, on the other hand, the friendly circle of earnest and enlightened scholars from whom he had there derived instruction and encouragement. The comparative calm of indifferentism seems to have prevailed at Cambridge, where Bishop Fisher, the Chancellor, was his only friend. He had 'his abode in Queen's College, where a study on the top of the south-west tower in the old court still retaineth his name.'¹ Writing to a friend in London, he says, 'Up to the present I have given lectures on the grammar of Chrysoloras to but few; perhaps I shall begin the grammar of Theodore to a more crowded class.'²

A divinity lectureship, that called after the Lady Margaret, had then been recently established. Erasmus was appointed by Fisher to the post, and continued to hold it during his residence at Cambridge (1511-14). It does not appear that there was any professorship of Greek, or indeed any source of Greek learning whatever in the University. The lectures of Erasmus in Greek were, therefore, a voluntary undertaking. As it turned out, the grammar of Theodore proved no more attractive than that of Chrysoloras, so that but for the assistance which he derived from his ecclesiastical preferment and the liberality of worthy friends, he might, for all that his Greek brought him, have starved. In time, however, he gathered a few scattered pupils, one or two of whom afterwards became on intimate terms with him. Among these was Henry Bullock, a Fellow of Queen's College, of whose studies in Greek he speaks with approval in a letter to Ammonius of Lucca, the Latin secretary to Henry VIII. 'Bovillus gnaviter Græcatur.' Next comes John Bryan, 'very learned,' a Fellow of King's; Robert Aldrich, 'a young man of a certain pleasing eloquence,' afterwards Provost of Eton and Bishop of Carlisle (1537-56); Richard Whitford, to whom he dedicated his translation of Lucian's *Tyrannicida*, and who, according to Wood, followed by Knight and Jortin, was an Oxford man; and Richard Sampson, of Trinity Hall, afterwards Lord President of Wales and Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield (1543-1555).³ These names of isolated and now forgotten students, whose only common tie was their association with Erasmus, contrast ill with those of Grocyn,

¹ Fuller's *Hist. Univ. Camb.* § 5, 48.

² 'Erasmus Ammonio.' Cambridge, 1511.

³ Mullinger, *Hist. Univ. Camb.*, pp. 499-500.

Linacre, More, and Colet, a united band of earnest fellow-workers in the cause of the emancipation of the human mind. As the modern historian of the University of Cambridge justly remarks :

‘Erasmus appears to have regarded his sojourn at Cambridge as a failure, and the language used by his different biographers implies, apparently, that such was also their opinion. He had almost totally failed to gather round him a circle of learners in any way worthy of his great reputation ; . . . while so completely were his efforts, as a teacher of Greek, ignored by the University, that on the occasion of Richard Croke (his virtual successor in this respect) being appointed to the office of Public Orator a few years later, the latter was honoured by admission to certain special privileges, expressly on the ground that “he had been the first introducer of Greek into the University.”’¹

Erasmus left Cambridge at the end of 1514, and although there appears to have been no one in the place qualified, like the Oxford scholars, by travel or acquirements to continue his instructions in Greek, it is certain that the heaven introduced by him was at work. Bullock, writing to him in 1516, says : ‘Here they are earnestly applying themselves to Greek learning and much desire your coming hither.’ Erasmus in reply, writing from Bishop Fisher’s palace at Rochester, says : ‘Would that I could awhile return to my old habits of life and literary fellowship, to me far the most pleasant.’² His edition of the Greek Testament had appeared six months before from the press of Frobenius at Basle, and much rancour had been excited by the satirical innuendos against the clergy contained in the commentary. How the Cambridge Dons revenged themselves, Wood has already told us.

The next we hear of Greek at Cambridge is that Bryan of King’s, the former pupil of Erasmus, began to give a course of lectures about the year 1518, not on Greek but on a subject which presupposed no slight acquaintance with Greek, Aristotle in the original. At this time, as has been seen, the struggle of the old and the new learning was raging most fiercely at Oxford. At Cambridge, according to the letter of Sir Thomas More to the University of Oxford, from which passages have been already quoted, the Greek lectureship received contributions even from those who did not attend. ‘At Cambridge, which you have been always wont to outshine, even those who do not study Greek, nevertheless, led by their common interest in their University, contribute, every man of them, very

¹ Mullinger, *Hist. Univ. Camb.*, p. 508.

² ‘Erasmus Rot. Henrico Bovillo suo.’ Rochester, August 1516.

creditably to the stipend of him who lectures on Greek to others.' This letter was written in 1519, some eight years after Erasmus had complained of his Cambridge lectureship, 'as for profit, I see none of it.'¹

But the lecturer who popularized Greek at Cambridge was Richard Croke, of King's College, who had been educated for some years at the Universities of Paris, Louvain, and Leipsic, at the expense of Erasmus's great patron, Archbishop Warham. Before going abroad, however, he had, after taking his Bachelor's degree at Cambridge in 1510, proceeded to Oxford to acquire Greek under the tuition of Grocyn. The knowledge obtained at Oxford he disseminated in Germany, where he gained the reputation of being the first to teach Greek in a rational and profitable method.² On his return to England he was appointed teacher of Greek to the king, and after having given some voluntary lectures at Cambridge he became in 1519 Greek Reader in that University. Upon appointment he delivered a series of orations.³ Like Sir Thomas More, he appealed to the spirit of academical rivalry. 'The Oxonians, whose betters you formerly were in every kind of knowledge, have hastened to Greek literature: they watch, they fast, they sweat, they freeze, they leave nothing undone to master it.' But Croke also advocated the study of Greek on more substantial grounds, as that it is the language of a most gifted race, employed by a great diversity of writers, in itself a completer instrument of speech than Latin, of extreme antiquity, the key to philology and philosophy, to mathematics and theology. He added, too, a consideration that, with some minds, was likely to be more potent, that it was a road to promotion and emolument. Croke's success in spreading an interest in Greek at Cambridge, as he had done in Germany, is attested by the hostile pen of the poet Skelton; and the increasing influence of the 'Græcists' in the University was proved by his election in 1522 as Public Orator for life.

The successful establishment of Croke as Greek Reader at Cambridge and the royal mandate of the same year (1519) to the University of Oxford mark the turning of the tide and the definite reception of Greek by the two Universities. So rapid was the progress of Cambridge under Croke's influence,

¹ Quoted by Mullinger, p. 494, n.

² Erasmus wrote on June 5, 1514, 'Croke holds sway in the University of Leipsic, giving public lectures on Greek literature' (quoted by Hallam, *Hist. Lit.*, part i. ch. iv.).

³ See Hallam, *Hist. Lit.*, part i. ch. iv.

that it has the credit of producing in 1521 the first book printed in England containing Greek letters, Linacre's translation of Galen *de Temperamentis*. Greek characters also appear on the title-page of a treatise by Erasmus's old pupil Bullock, and in 1524 for the quotations contained in Linacre's 'de emendatâ structurâ orationis.'¹

In 1524 Croke was sent abroad by the king on business in connexion with the divorce, and his place at Cambridge was taken by Robert Wakefield, who had been a professor at Tübingen, and in whose return to England Henry had taken a personal interest. Wakefield did not remain many years at Cambridge, for about 1530 he was promoted by the king to be Hebrew² Professor at Oxford as a reward for his ready service in the matter of the divorce, in which, if a letter addressed by Paice to Henry is to be trusted, 'he was ready to solve the question either in the negative or affirmative, just as the king thought proper, and in such a manner as all the divines in England should not be able to make reply.'³

It has already been observed that by 1520 Greek was taught both at S. Paul's School and at Eton. Churton quotes Strype as an authority that Nowell, afterwards Dean of S. Paul's, and who had been educated at Brasenose, of which Collège he became a Fellow in 1536, taught Greek in 1543 in Westminster School.⁴ Between thirty and fifty years later this was nothing uncommon, and Greek was certainly taught at Merchant Taylors',⁵ Winchester, Harrow, and probably at Hawkeshead School in Lancashire.⁶ In these cases Greek had been introduced by the enterprise and energy of

¹ Hallam, *Hist. Lit.*, part i. ch. v.

² It may be noticed by the way that the first Hebrew letters printed in England were printed for Wakefield's 'Oratio de laudibus et utilitate trium linguarum,' by Wynkyn de Worde in 1524.

³ Cited by Phillips in his *Life of Cardinal Pole*. London, 1767.

⁴ Churton's *Life of Nowell*, p. 10.

⁵ The first Head Master of Merchant Taylors' was Richard Mulcaster (1561-81), who had in 1548 been elected from Eton to King's College, Cambridge, but had, shortly afterwards, removed to a studentship at Christ Church, Oxford. He was celebrated for his knowledge of Greek and also of Hebrew, which last he introduced at the school. In 1571, we read that 'Watts (Archdeacon of Middlesex) examined the boys in Homer as to their skill in Greek, which was his favourite language, and then Horne (Bishop of Winchester, 1560-79) tried them in the Hebrew Psalter, in all which exercises they were well allowed' (Wilson's *History of Merchant Taylors' School*. London, 1814). Mulcaster was the teacher of Lancelot Andrewes, of Pembroke College, Cambridge, Bishop of Winchester (1618-28), the most learned scholar of his time, and master, it was said, of fifteen languages.

⁶ See Hallam, *Lit. Hist.*, part ii. ch. i.

the masters, but in 1541 Henry VIII. issued a royal ordinance that Greek should be taught at the grammar schools attached to the cathedrals.

Greek having thus at length secured some footing, the next controversy of which we hear was as to its correct pronunciation. Continental scholars were divided into two hostile camps as to this question, nicknamed respectively Itacists and Etists. The former received their name from the fact that in modern Greek no appreciable distinction is maintained between the iota, when in conjunction with another vowel it forms a diphthong, and the iota when it stands alone. Reuchlin and Melancthon adhered to the Itacists, or, as it is called, Romaic pronunciation, Erasmus to the Etist. The distinction which the Etists obtained from the support of Erasmus procured them the name of Erasmians, notwithstanding that the real father of the controversy appears to have been Aldus Manutius. There were indeed eminent names on both sides, H. Stephens, Beza, and Vossius following Manutius and Erasmus, while the Itacists, besides Reuchlin, numbered the two Scaligers and Salmasius.¹ The apostles of the new, or Erasmian, pronunciation in England were Smith, who became Greek Lecturer at Cambridge in 1533, and Cheke, who in 1540 was appointed first Regius Professor of Greek in that University. They insisted that the ancients had distinguished the several diphthongs by separate sounds, and 'that by this revived pronunciation was displayed the flower and plentifulness of that language, the variety of vowels, the grandeur of diphthongs, the majesty of long letters and the grace of distinct speech.'² Wood, once more, we think, with more zeal than discretion, says that 'the Oxonians were the first that received the "new pronunciation."' At Cambridge Stephen Gardiner, at that time Chancellor of the University, attacked the innovation with as much acrimony as if it had been a heresy. The reformers, on the other hand, bold in the name of Erasmus, were not slow to reply to Gardiner's strictures, and a literary warfare was waged between the two parties of English scholars. Cheke's share in the controversy was printed, together with Gardiner's letters, by Cœlius Secundus Curio of Basle, with whom Cheke deposited his papers as he passed through Basle on his way to Italy, where, upon Mary's accession, he sought refuge. The book was published under the title *Joannis Cheki Angli de Pronunciatione Græcæ*

¹ The tractates which this controversy produced were collected in two volumes by Sigebert Havercamp, of Leyden, in 1736-40.

² Strype, cited by Hallam, *Hist. Lit.*, part i. ch. v.

potissimum Linguae Disputationes cum Stephano Wintoniensi Episcopo, septem contrariis epistolis comprehensæ, and was dedicated to Sir Anthony Cook, who, like himself, was tutor to King Edward VI. Gardiner, whose hostility to the change was whetted by the sympathy of its supporters with the reforming movement, went so far, according to Wood, as to deprive Cheke of his professorship; but the latter, assisted by the arguments of Smith,¹ who enjoyed considerable reputation for scholarship, and possibly fortified by the example of Oxford, carried public sentiment with him. Roger Ascham, for instance, who had been lecturer in Greek in S. John's College, Cambridge, and was at first averse to Cheke's innovations, became a convert and strenuous supporter, perhaps as much alienated from the Itacists by the imperiousness and dogmatism of Gardiner as convinced by the arguments of Cheke. In an undated epistle, 'Brandisboeo amico suo carissimo,'² Ascham criticizes with severity Gardiner's conduct of the controversy. The Bishop declared the new fashion 'barbarous,' on the ground that it was unintelligible to the Greeks themselves; and Dr. Caius, in the tract to which reference has already been made, mentions the fact that a Greek Patriarch, who visited London in King Edward's time (1547-53), could not understand Cheke, nor Cheke the Patriarch. To this Cheke and his friends retorted that the fault lay in the departure of the modern Greeks from the pronunciation of the ancients, an argument which was clinched by a sentiment to which Fuller sturdily gives expression, 'nor mattereth it if foreigners dissent, seeing hereby we Englishmen shall understand one another.' This feeling, aided perhaps by increasing slovenliness of scholarship, led to further and unwarrantable changes in the same direction, until we arrived at the completely Anglicized Greek in vogue at the present day.³

¹ Smith wrote an epistle to Gardiner on the subject, which was printed by Robert Stephens in quarto, in 1568, under the title 'de rectâ et emendatâ linguæ Græcæ pronunciatione.' Smith, it may be mentioned, was also an advocate of the phonetic spelling of English. Another distinguished supporter of Cheke and Smith was John Ponet or Poyntet, a pupil of Smith, who early read Greek lectures in the new pronunciation. By a curious irony of fortune Poyntet, in 1549, displaced Gardiner in the Bishopric of Winchester, himself giving place once more to that prelate in 1553.

² Aschami *Epistolæ*, lib. ii. epist. ix. Oxon. MDCCIII.

³ The Reformation brought about the same alteration in Latin, it being no longer desirable, as before, to pronounce according to Catholic usage. The change in this case was, however, more gradual, owing to the greater diffusion of the language. The pronunciation of Latin as

The close of the reign of Henry VIII. was distinguished by this circle of illustrious Cambridge scholars, only second in interest to those who some years earlier had at Oxford been the precursors of the Reformation. Ascham's letters throw much light, generally tinged however with the rosy hues of hope, upon the state of learning at Cambridge about this time. In the letter 'R. Brandisboeo,' already cited, he says :—

'Aristotle and Plato are to-day—ay, and have been for five years past, read by the young men in the original; Sophocles and Euripides are better known here than Plautus used to be when you were here; Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, are more on the tongues and in the hands of all than Livy then was. You see youths with copies of Isocrates oftener than of old you saw them with copies of Terence. This zest for study, the industry and example of our friend Cheke set aflame and has kept alive. He has given free public lectures on the whole of Homer, the whole of Sophocles—and that twice over—the whole of Euripides, and almost the whole of Herodotus.'

In an undated letter to Cranmer when Archbishop of Canterbury, Ascham again enters upon the topic of Cambridge studies. After some observations upon the pursuit of theology, and a mention of Plato and Aristotle as favourite authors at the University, he proceeds with the same enumeration as before, and again unreservedly ascribes the happy condition of Cambridge scholarship to the meritorious energy of Cheke. Ascham unfortunately is scarcely less bitten by academical partisanship than Wood himself, and conceives his laudation of Cambridge imperfect unless accompanied by a disparagement of Oxford. Having extolled the learning of the one, he therefore proceeds—

'What all the Oxford people are about I have not an idea, but a few months ago, at court, I fell in with a certain person of that

English probably arose in the first instance from mere slovenliness, for we find it spoken of at first as a token of a bad Latin scholar. Of course the disuse of a common model, the Italian pronunciation, increased the tendency, and to this must be added the insular and Protestant feeling, at that date so powerful, to which Fuller gives utterance. But the new pronunciation of Latin had not obtained complete acceptance even as late as the time of Milton, who was strenuously adverse to it. In the preface to the *Accidence* (1669) he remarks that 'few will be persuaded to pronounce Latin otherwise than their own English.' To check this he recommends in his treatise of 'education' that the speech of boys should be 'fashioned to a distinct and clear pronunciation, as near as may be to the Italian, especially in the vowels;' and adds, 'to smatter Latin with an English mouth is as ill learning as Law-French.' Nevertheless Evelyn, some time after, remarks of the Westminster scholars 'their odd pronunciation of Latin, so that out of England none were able to understand or endure it.'

university, who, by his excessive preference for Lucian, Plutarch, and Herodian, Seneca, Aurelius Gellius, and Apuleius, seemed to me to be confining both Greek and Latin to their period of extreme decline and decay.'

From the Universities he passes to the general state of English learning. He affirms—and the statement holds good even down to the present day—'The nobility in England were at no time more learned.' Among these learned aristocrats he singles out for special commendation the Duke of Suffolk, and of the ladies, the Lady Elizabeth.

After all reasonable allowance for the partiality of Ascham's judgment, Oxford must be pronounced to have at this moment played the second part. The great names in the struggle for emancipation, whether on its theological or literary side, belonged from 1540 to about 1560, to Cambridge. In the earlier part of this period the Protestant interest, with which men of learning, like Cheke and Ascham, were generally beginning to associate themselves, was gradually growing in strength; and inasmuch as that party was more numerous and influential at Cambridge, the University of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, the counsellors of Edward VI. looked naturally in that direction for support in the Church and amongst the learned world. Oxford, on the other hand, seemed for a while smitten with the barrenness engendered of religious strife. The fair promise of the earlier years of the century had failed. It is true that Henry VIII. had endeavoured to encourage classical learning, as by his ordinance of 1535, that a classical lecturer should be maintained by those colleges which had theretofore been without such provision, and in other ways which we have had occasion to notice. But such potent foes of learning were the distractions of the times, that in 1537 Wood records of Oxford —'The university and colleges were now reduced low in respect of riches and wealth, and also as to number of scholars . . . most of the halls or hostels were left empty and threatened a decay; arts declined and ignorance began to take place again.' Greedy courtiers presently suggested that a dissolution of monasteries might be fitly followed by a dissolution of colleges. Fortunately for learning, Henry's conceit of himself as a patron of literature was stronger than his rapacity, and he replied to the temptation in language which does him honour:—

'I perceive,' he said, 'the abbey lands have fleshed you and set your teeth on edge, to ask also these colleges. And whereas wee had a regarde only to pull down sin by defacing the monasteries, you

VOL. XVIII.—NO. XXXVI.

T

have a desire also to overthrow all goodness by subversion of the colleges. I tell you, sirs, that I judge no land in England better bestowed than that which is given to our universities, for by their maintenance our realme shall be well governed when we be dead and rotten. As you love your welfare, therefore, follow no more this veine . . . for I love not learning so ill, that I will impair the revenues of anie one house by a penie, whereby it may be upholden.¹

But though preserved from the cupidity of the courtier, Oxford was spoiled by the barbarity of the fanatic. In 1550 certain Visitors, appointed by the king and council, undertook to purge the Oxford libraries of books, in their judgment opposed to 'sound religion and useful learning.' According to Wood their proceedings were a crusade against learning of all sorts.

'Many MSS., guilty of no other superstition than red letters in their fronts or titles, were either condemned to the fire or jakes . . . I have heard it credibly reported from ancient men, and they while young from scholars of great standing, that among such spoils brought out in public . . . several copies of the Greek Testament were of the number, which, had they not been understood by one wiser than the rest, had suffered the same fate; but sure I am that such books, wherein appeared angles or mathematical diagrams, were thought sufficient to be destroyed, because accounted popish or diabolical, or both.'²

Wood declares that prior to this visitation—

'The Oxonians were furnished with Greek books, and the libraries of several colleges abounded with them, as Simon Grynæus, a foreigner, testifieth; who, when he had seeked through Europe for the commentaries of Proclus, found them at length at Oxford, and from the libraries there carried away divers copies of the said author, as he confesseth in epistle to John, the son of Thomas More.³ But whatever books were left of that language in the said libraries were, as 'tis supposed, damned by ignorant zealots in the reign of King Edward VI.'⁴

The expression 'as 'tis supposed' contrasts strikingly with the positiveness of the assertions of the first passage quoted. According to Wood, the moving spirit in this work

¹ Wood, *Hist. and Antiq. Univ. Oxford*, II. i. 66.

² *Id. ib.* II. i. 108, sub anno 1550.

³ Grynæus was a friend of Melancthon and Professor of Greek at Heidelberg in 1523. He was introduced by Erasmus to Sir Thomas More, upon visiting England, in 1531. The 'epistle' here spoken of is his prefatory epistle to his edition of Plato's *Works*, Basle, 1534, in which he makes great acknowledgment of the courtesy of Sir Thomas More.

⁴ Wood, *Hist. and Antiq. Univ. Oxford*, II. i. 76, sub anno 1545.

of destruction was Cox, afterwards Bishop of Ely, who, if a zealot, was certainly not ignorant.¹ As all ancient ecclesiastical dilapidations are to-day imputed to Oliver Cromwell, so we suspect that party spirit rather than regard for truth suggested many of the aspersions upon the reforming Visitors. It is certain that the Oxford libraries were at no time extensive, and Leland's investigations had disclosed, in one instance at any rate, the fashion in which they were maintained.²

The uncertainties of the times and the virulence of theological dispute continued further to depress learning at the Universities. 'The two wells of learning,' said a Court preacher in 1552, 'Oxford and Cambridge, are dried up; students decayed, of which scarce an hundred left of a thousand, and if in seven years more they should decay so fast there would be scarcely none at all.'³ It might be open to suspicion, but for independent testimony, that Wood, in his antipathy to the reformers, had overstated the case. But a letter quoted by him from S. John's College, Cambridge, to the Duke of Somerset, the Lord Protector, points out some of the difficulties with which the scantily endowed colleges of that day were forced to struggle. The college complains of the greed of the holders of the Abbey lands, who were beginning to threaten the seminaries of learning—a statement, as we have seen, not without foundation—of the increased cost of living unsupported by increasing revenues; of the cessation of endowments and benefactions, a combination of causes which it declares has divorced from it some of its most gifted members.⁴ The Oxford Schools of Arts, according to Wood, 'were used by laundresses to dry their clothes.' In addition to the reasons for the decay of learning set forth

¹ Fuller disbelieved the charge against Cox. He says, 'The effects of this visitation do not appear, save only that they so clearly purged the University from all monuments of superstition, that they left not one book of many goodly manuscripts wherewith it was furnished by the munificence of several benefactors . . . The blame is commonly cast on Doctor Cox, who, as one saith (Sir John Harrington), being then Chancellor of the University, so cancelled the books thereof, they could never since recover them. Indeed I find another author charging him therewith, but with this parenthesis (" 'tis said "), and my charity would fain believe fame a false report therein, finding him otherwise a deserving person, very well qualified, &c.—Fuller, *Ch. Hist. Brit.* VII. xvi.

² See Leland's account of his visit in 1530 to the famous library of the Franciscans at Oxford. *Scrip. Brit.* p. 286, quoted in Warton, *Hist. Eng. Poet.* (ed. Hazlitt), II. 270.

³ Bernard Gilpin, quoted by Wood, *Hist. and Antiq.* I. 112.

⁴ Wood, *ut supra*, and see Ascham's *Epistles*, p. 293.

by S. John's, was another, the immediate consequence of the dissolution of the monasteries. Many of these foundations had had schools attached to them, and the houses of the Abbots were, as the houses of great lords had been at earlier times, centres of training for the nobility and gentry. Warton quotes from the account-books of the mitred monastery of Hyde, near Winchester, an example of this: 'for eight gentle youths boarding for the sake of learning with our Lord Abbot and living at our Lord's table, with their varlets accompanying them, this year 17^l. 9s.' This was about the year 1450. At Glastonbury, Richard Whiting, the last Abbot, educated nearly three hundred young men of good family. Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury in Elizabeth's reign, had thus been brought up in the monastery of Wellhow, in Lincolnshire, by his uncle Robert Whitgift, the Abbot, 'who,' says Strype, 'had several other young gentlemen under his care for education.' In 1523, Robert Shirwoode, an Englishman, Professor of Greek and Hebrew at Louvain, dedicated to John Webbe, prior of the Benedictine cathedral convent at Coventry, a Latin translation of Ecclesiastes with criticisms upon the Hebrew text. At Winchcombe in Gloucestershire the Abbot Kederminster established regular lectures upon Greek and Hebrew.¹ It follows, therefore, that the Universities, which were in great part supplied by such sources, suffered in scholarship from their extinction, and this is sufficient to account for the general complaints of the decay of learning at Oxford and Cambridge during the reign of so well-disposed a sovereign as Edward VI., whose industry in the foundation of grammar schools could not at once repair the mischief wrought by his father.

The accession of Mary brought with it more burnings of books at the Universities, though this time, fortunately for scholarship, chiefly English bibles, and a general flight of Reformers to Strasburg, Frankfort, and Zürich. Many of these refugees were persons of culture, and indeed the majority of them belonged, in the nature of things, to the well-to-do classes. Ascham, through the friendship of Gardiner, succeeded in retaining his Fellowship unmolested during these troubled times, notwithstanding his known alliance with the Reformers. His friend Cheke, however, had been less prudent, and his courage and pertinacity in literary controversy had not furthered him with his powerful opponent. He, therefore, judged it advisable to emigrate. Among his

Warton, *Hist. Poet.* iv. 9, 10.

companions in exile was Sir Anthony Cook, the father of four famous daughters, the most learned women of the age. The little band of fugitives, despite the ties of common sufferings, common hopes and common literary interests, was unfortunately not exempt from theological discord. Yet, their distresses and dissensions notwithstanding, the influence of Cheke and Cook never permitted them to forget that their party claimed to be the friends of learning. At Strasburg they formed a college with a common table, and, assisted by subsidies from the King of Denmark, the Free Cities, and the Protestant interest of Germany, devoted themselves to classical and theological studies. Jewel was there; Nowell, the famous head master of Westminster, afterwards Dean of S. Paul's; Poynt, Bishop of Winchester, the supposed author of King Edward VI.'s Catechism; Becon, who had been chaplain to the Protector Somerset, author of the *Pomander of Prayer*, a work of much repute in its day; Aylmer the tutor of Lady Jane Grey, afterwards Bishop of London; and Grindal and Sandys, both advanced in happier days to the archiepiscopal see of York, and the former ultimately to Canterbury. 'Nor did the learned laymen, Sir John Cheke, Sir Richard Morison, Sir Peter Carew, Sir Thomas Wroth and others, disdain to hear Peter Martyr expounding Aristotle's Ethics and the Book of Judges.'¹ The *Livre des Anglois à Genève*² gives some other well-known names among the refugees at that place; among them, Miles Coverdalle, Bishop of Exeter; Thomas Lever, Master of S. John's, Cambridge, in the reign of Edward VI.; James Pilkington, afterwards Bishop of Durham; William Cole, afterwards President of Corpus, Oxford, and Dean of Lincoln; Thomas, the son of John Bodleigh, handed down to posterity as Sir Thomas Bodley; 'Guillaume Whittingham,' the Puritan Dean of Durham, and husband of the sister of Calvin, and 'Johan Knoxe.'

At Zürich, Mullins, a distinguished scholar, afterwards Archdeacon of London, was appointed Greek Reader to the exiled community.³ A scanty subsistence was gained by literature, and the pursuit of the study of Greek under difficulties was attested by the Latin translations, *Philo de Nobilitate* and *Origen de Rectâ Fide*, from the pen of Laurence Humfrey, the learned ex-President of Magdalen, Oxford, and

¹ Churton's *Life of Nowell*, p. 23.

² Published by John Southerden Burn. London, 1831.

³ Newcome's *Repertorium*, i. 60.

the biographer of his friend and fellow in exile, Bishop Jewel.

In England, meanwhile, scholarship decayed.

'The love of good learning began suddenly to wax cold; the knowledge of the tongues, in spite of some that therein had flourished, was manifestly contemned, and so the way of right study manifestly perverted; the choice good authors of malice confounded; old sophistry, I say not well, not old, but that new rotten sophistry, began to beard and shoulder logic in their own tongue. Yea, I know that heads were cast together and counsel devised that Duns and all the rabble of barbarous questionists should have dispossessed of their places and room Aristotle, Plato, Tully, and Demosthenes, whom good Mr. Redman¹ and those two worthy stars of the University, Mr. Cheke and Mr. Smith, with their scholars, had brought to flourish as notably in Cambridge as ever they did in Greece and in Italy, and for the doctrine of those four, the four pillars of learning, Cambridge then giving place to no University, neither in France, Spain, Germany, or Italy.'²

Upon the accession of Elizabeth scholars took heart once more. The exiles returned, and the Universities began to revive. But the ecclesiastical policy of Elizabeth was at first so undetermined that, in spite of her sympathies, and notwithstanding that the chief of the sufferers were called to preach before the Queen, they were not restored to their preferments; so that, as Sandys lamented to Parker, 'they were not so bare in the time of their exile as now on their return.'³

Up to this point we have chiefly pursued the advance of learning in the schools and Universities, but there are many indications, to some of which allusion has been made, that classical studies became, with the Reformation, the 'mode' of society. No doubt there was at times an affectation which also served the purpose of a party badge. A very curious example of this occurs in the life of Sir Ralph Sadleir, a soldier and diplomatist in the employ of Henry VIII. and his successor, and which is a remarkable indication of the way in which royal patronage had imbued courtiers with a respect for literature. In 1540 Sadleir was sent on a mission to James V. of Scotland, and his letter, addressed to one of

¹ This Redman, or Redmayne, was a friend of Cheke and was, in 1547, appointed first Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. 'He was,' says Burnet, 'esteemed the most learned and judicious divine of that time' (*Hist. Reform.* pt. i. bk. iii.). Divines of that time had need to be 'judicious.'

² Quoted by Hallam from Ascham, *Hist. Lit.* pt. ii. ch. i. We cannot light upon the passage in Ascham's works.

³ Churton's *Life of Nowell*, § iii. p. 37.

the Privy Council (probably Thomas Cromwell), detailing the incidents of his embassy, contains the following quaint passage: 'I had no good will of the bishops and priests. They raised a bruit . . . that all my men were monks and that I had them out of the abbeyes in England, and now they were serving-men. I gave a Greek word on my men's coat sleeves which is, Μόνον ἀνακτι δουλεύω, the Latin whereof is *soli regi servio*. Now the bishops here have interpreted my word to be, as they call it, *monachulus*, which, as they say, is in English 'a little monk,' a diminutive of *monachus*, and thus they affirmed of a verity. Whereupon they bruited that all my men were monks, but it appeareth they are no good Grecians. And now the effect of my word is known, they be well laughed at for their learned interpretation.'

Edward VI. was, like his father, well-read and a favourer of learning. The British Museum contains a folio MS. in his hand of exercises in Greek as well as Latin. Ascham, writing in December 1550, when he was only twelve years of age, says of him, 'he has studied dialectic and is now studying Aristotle's Ethics in Greek. He has advanced so far in the Greek tongue that he can, with great ease, render into Greek out of the Latin passages in Cicero's philosophy. . . . In a short while he will finish the Ethics and will then go on to Aristotle's Rhetoric.'

The reputation for learning of Lady Jane Grey has survived to the present day, chiefly through the letters of Ascham. His account of her preference of Plato to the hunting-field is a life-like and well-known picture.³ Even the narrow bigot, Mary,⁴ had some tincture of scholarship. Towards the close of her father's reign she undertook the translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrase on the Gospel of S. John*, at the suggestion, it is said, of Queen Catherine Parr. This translation was first printed in the first volume of Erasmus's *Paraphrase of the New Testament* 1548. It was prepared by Nicholas Udall, the learned head master of Eton, who illustrates the prevailing fashion of learning. He speaks of

'the great number of noble women at that time in England, not only given to the study of human sciences and strange tongues, but . . . also in translating good books out of Latin or Greek into English, for the use and commodity of such as are rude and ignorant of the said tongues. It was now no news in England to see young damsels in noble houses and in the courts of princes, instead

¹ *Memoir of the Life and Times of Sir Ralph Sadleir*, by Major Sadleir-Stoney. London, 1877-80.

² Asch. *Epist.* I. iv.

³ *Id. ib.*

⁴ *Id. Epist.* I. iii.

of cards and other instruments of idle trifling, to have continually in their hands some book of Holy Scripture matters, and as familiarly both to read and reason thereof in Greek, Latin, French, or Italian as in English. It was now a common thing to see young virgins so trained in the study of good letters that they willingly set all other pastimes at nought for learning's sake,' &c.

But, in spite of all this and of the compliments which Udall presently showered upon the fair translator, one of Mary's earliest measures as Queen was the suppression of this very book.

The eulogies of Udall upon Mary are surpassed by those of Ascham upon Elizabeth, and were no doubt better deserved. In a letter to Sturmius, in April 1550, he recites her accomplishments:—

'Under my tuition she has studied Greek and Latin for two years past. She speaks French and Italian as well as English, Latin with facility, accuracy, and judgment. She has frequently and with interest conversed with me even in Greek not unskilfully. Nothing can be finer than her handwriting in Greek and Latin. Although a most expert musician, yet she does not take much delight in music. The beginning of the day she always devoted to the New Testament in Greek; after that she used to read select orations of Isocrates and the tragedies of Sophocles.'¹

Her letters to her brother Edward contain quotations from Pindar, and in 1555, even during the anxious days of Mary's reign, she was continuing her studies. Ascham speaks of her as reading *Æschines*, and *Demosthenes* 'on the Crown.'² Hence, soon after her accession, in 1562, Ascham was able to say of her, 'This I will take occasion to add: There are not at Court, in the Universities, nor among the leading men of Church or State, four of our countrymen who understand Greek better than the Queen herself.'³ Her readiness was such that he speaks of having been present at a reception of ambassadors, 'when on one occasion she made answer with ease, without hesitation, trippingly, without confusion, to three orators, the ambassadors of the Empire, of France, and of Sweden, addressing them in three languages, one in Italian, the second in French, the third in Latin, with regard to the various topics which chanced to find place in their speeches.' This there is no reason to doubt, yet we cannot but think that Ascham's loyal enthusiasm at times betrayed him into adulation when we read, 'Her beauty, her greatness, her wisdom, and her industry are all most eminent';⁴ for on

¹ Ascham, *Epistolæ* I. ii.

² *Id. ib.* I. xii.

³ *Id. ib.* I. xi.

⁴ *Id. ib.* I. ii.

the first of these excellences the evidence of contemporary painters compels a more moderate judgment.

Among other learned ladies of the same period, the daughters of Sir Thomas More and of Sir Anthony Cook are specially illustrious. Of the former, Margaret Roper, whose touching devotion to her father is historical, was the friend of Erasmus, Pole, Ascham, and the other *litterati* of the time. Her acquirements in Greek scholarship have been perpetuated by a translation from Eusebius into Latin. She was the mother of five children, and one of her daughters, Lady Clarke, rivalled herself in reputation for learning. Perhaps even better known are the four daughters of Sir Anthony Cook. Of these the eldest, Mildred, married William Cecil, Lord Burghley, himself a Greek scholar. Lady Burghley's reading in that language was so extensive that, after exhausting the classical authors, she studied the Christian Fathers, among whom are particularly enumerated Basil, Cyril, Chrysostom, and Gregory Nazianzen. The second daughter, Anne, devoted herself more to the study of Latin and Italian, from which she produced several translations, though Strype mentions receiving from her, along with her translation of Bishop Jewel's *Apology for the Church of England*, an epistle in Greek. She married Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, and became by him mother of Francis Bacon, the Lord Chancellor, best known as Lord Bacon. The third daughter, Elizabeth, not less learned than her sisters, married Sir Thomas Hobby, of Bisham Abbey in Berkshire, Queen Elizabeth's ambassador to France. Her zeal for learning, according to tradition, led her to inflict severe corporal chastisement upon her children, one of whom she is said to have beaten to death. Her ghost long haunted, and perhaps still haunts, a certain room in Bisham Abbey, from which the cries of a child and the sounds of beating at times issued. It is said that during the progress of repairs at the Abbey in 1840, copy-books stained with tears and blood, and belonging to this date, were discovered behind the wainscoting of the haunted room.¹ At any rate, her reputation for severity did not prevent her securing a second husband, for after the death of Sir Thomas Hobby, she married John, Lord Russell, son and heir to Francis Russell, Earl of Bedford, whose monument still stands in Westminster Abbey embellished with Greek and Latin inscriptions by the pen of this learned lady. The fourth

¹ See *Murray's Guide Book to Berks, Bucks and Oxon.* 2nd ed. (1872), p. 98.

daughter, Katharine, is recorded as having been acquainted with Hebrew, as well as with Greek and Latin. She married Sir Henry Killigrew, and, although she left no Greek or Latin of her own composition behind, her death gave occasion to many epitaphs, and among them one, partly in Greek, partly in Latin verse, from the facile and erudite pen of her sister, Lady Russell.

The accession of Elizabeth was not, as has been noticed, at once followed by the restoration of the Protestant scholars to their benefices. The fact was that those with whom preferment lay were cautious of hastily committing themselves to the Protestant interest, since the religious disposition of the Queen appeared to vacillate. Even so powerful a nobleman as the Duke of Norfolk gave no response to the prayers of John Fox, the martyrologist, who had been his tutor, notwithstanding that Fox was on the point of starvation, because 'it seemed not safe for him to take notice or shew compassion to Fox or that sort of men.'¹ But, though time-servers hesitated, the Protestant party and the *literati* generally took heart of grace, and as the Queen's opinions gradually defined themselves, the enthusiasm for the new learning, classical as well as religious, revived at the Universities.

With the final victory of the Reformation under Elizabeth our retrospect comes to an end. We have seen how the study of Greek was made one of those great side-issues vital to the contest between the decaying system and the new movement. Elizabeth and her successor did much to encourage it, and even its modern detractors are constrained to admit that from the Reformation to the present day it has moulded the finest intelligences of the nation.

¹ Strype, p. 193. This was as late as the close of 1559.

FEV
cite
had
and
tiga
the
who
Wh
hav
won
as I
be s

war
nec
the
sys
par
dat
with

ART. II.—ON THE STUDY OF MIND
IN ANIMALS.

1. *Animal Intelligence*. By GEORGE J. ROMANES, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S., &c. (London, 1882.)
2. *Mental Evolution in Animals*. By the same Author. With a Posthumous Essay on Instinct, by CHARLES DARWIN, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. (London, 1883.)
3. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th edition. Art. 'Instinct.' By G. J. ROMANES.
4. *The Passions of Animals*. By EDWARD P. THOMPSON. (London, 1851.)
5. *Etudes sur les Facultés mentales des Animaux comparées à celles de l'Homme*. Par J. C. HOUZEAU, Membre de l'Académie de Belgique. (Bruxelles, 1872.)
6. *Mind in the Lower Animals in Health and Disease*. By W. LAUDER LINDSAY, M.D. (London, 1879.)
7. *Bird Life; being a History of the Bird, its Structure and Habits, together with Sketches of Fifty Different Species*. By Dr. A. E. BREHM. Translated from the German by H. M. LABOUCHERE, F.Z.S., and W. JESSE, C.M.Z.S. (London, 1874.)

FEW subjects that have attracted so much attention and excited so much interest as the mental powers of animals have had so small a share of real scientific treatment. Some orders and species have been carefully observed by competent investigators, but the attempts to produce an orderly account of the psychical characters existing in the subject creation as a whole have been neither very numerous nor very successful. While comparative anatomy and comparative physiology have been elaborated in extreme detail by a host of scientific workers, comparative psychology is a branch of science that, as Professor Huxley declared only five years ago, could hardly be said to exist.

Yet neither can it be said that it is a branch that is not wanted. Physiology and philosophy (in the strict sense) are necessarily incomplete without its aid. It is implicated with the physiologist's exposition of the functions of the nervous system, while the theory of knowledge, that forms so large a part of philosophical inquiry, ought to have amongst its foundations or other supports well-reasoned conclusions, whether with regard to the resemblances or the differences between

human knowledge and that possessed by those inhabitants of earth lower than man who, to use Milton's words—

‘also know
And reason not contemptibly.’

As a matter of fact the physiologist has had to be contented with the facts and inferences provided by the observers of particular species or classes. Philosophers have, in many cases, either manufactured their own comparative psychology or have simply adopted the superficial data of the subject that seemed to be supplied by common sense. Everyone who, in studying Kant's philosophy, has desired to discover its bearings on mind in the lower animals must have felt that something was lacking to the complete exposition of this point.

It is to be noted, moreover, that the estimation of the importance of the subject and of its subsidiary studies has undergone a vast change. Even Kirby and Spence found it necessary to vindicate the claims of entomology to be regarded as a serious pursuit. Before their time Sulzer, in Germany, on showing his works on insects, with their plates, to two friends, was commended by the one for employing his leisure hours in preparing prints that would amuse children, while the other admitted that the patterns would be very useful to ladies. In our day the patience and ingenuity shown by one observer in investigating the habits of ants, and by another in investigating those of earthworms, have been gratefully appreciated by numerous readers of their books.

The rise in importance of animal psychology is not merely due to the fact that to modern science nothing comes amiss; it is largely due to the stimulus given to the inquiry by the doctrine of evolution. Behind the questions of comparative psychology loom the great problems raised once more by our age, and raised, we cannot but feel, to receive a solution that we only hesitate to call final because the past history of controversy forbids us. Man is on his trial. Religion is on her trial. Nay, a deeper word must be said, but reverence compels us to change the form. The question is raised whether mind is at the bottom of things or only on the surface—only, in fact, an outcome of the play of atoms.

Comparative psychology, then, is summoned into court to give her evidence in the great cause, just as comparative religion has been already examined. For our part, though fully admitting that we have not a ready-made solution for all the difficulties of the case, yet we are convinced that the ver-

dict on the issues raised, so far as it shall depend upon the evidence of the younger science, will not vary in character from the verdict as regards Christianity so far as this depends upon the comparatively older, though still young, science of religion. Professor Goldwin Smith's article on 'Evolutionary Ethics and Christianity' in the *Contemporary Review* for last December may not accord in all points with the views of the Catholic Church, but it corroborates, in the presence of the documentary evidence furnished by the chief sacred books of the world, the opinion given by Professor Max Müller before this evidence had arrived, that Christianity had nothing to fear from comparative religion. Even so we make bold to say religious belief has nothing to fear from comparative psychology.

The parallel just suggested admits of being traced somewhat further. It will be acknowledged by those who have listened to the evidence of comparative religion, or, in other words, have learnt to appreciate the treasures of truth contained in some non-Christian religions,¹ that some errors have been corrected, some prejudices have been removed. A deeper meaning has been given to the statement that God left not Himself without witness among heathen nations, and a flood of light has been thrown upon the fact that God's law is written in the hearts of men.² May we not be prepared for analogous results to follow from the testimony of comparative psychology?

It would be premature to define exactly how current views will have to be modified. But one practical result of the closer attention to the mental constitution of animals is already visible in the deeper sympathy with them that marks our age, the wider acknowledgment of humanity towards them as a duty. This result, so consonant to the spirit of Christianity, will have, we trust, much fuller development; and we venture to suggest that religious teachers ought not to neglect any fitting opportunity of contributing towards that development by inculcating the duty of kindness towards our dependent fellow-creatures. If there is mystery in the sufferings of animals, as undoubtedly there is, it should be remembered that He whose 'tender mercies are over all His works' in placing man at the head of the terrestrial creation has given

¹ Professor Goldwin Smith, however, does not believe in the existence of these treasures. He declares that 'after a perusal of the long series' of the Sacred Books of the East, he can find in them hardly a trace 'of anything spiritual, universal, moral.'

² Rom. ii. 15.

him the power and the vocation to be a fellow-worker with Himself in mitigating a lot that seems inevitable.

The study of animal psychology presents at the outset the serious difficulty that the facts can only be interpreted by analogy. From the resemblance, more or less close, of the behaviour of the lower animals to that by which human beings manifest their emotions or their intellectual powers the presence of similar psychical qualities is inferred in the animals. This process of inference is doubtless trustworthy so long as those animals only are in question whose general structure, and more particularly whose nervous system, including the brain, correspond to our own. Long, however, before science had traced the functions of the nervous system, and discovered the extent to which homology, or correspondence of parts, prevails, the common sense of mankind had repudiated the notion connected with the name of Descartes that all the lower animals are mere automata. It could not be denied that the dog, for example, gives evidence of pleasure, pain, affection, fear, rage, memory, &c.¹ And the same may be said of all the higher vertebrata. Physiological science has here confirmed general opinion. 'So far as observation and experiment can take us,' says Professor Huxley, 'the structure and the functions of the nervous system are fundamentally the same in an ape, or in a dog, and in a man.'

When we descend to lower orders of creation the inferences from analogy become less and less certain, and the discoveries of modern science with regard to reflex action (which is purely mechanical and may go on without consciousness) have imported an additional element of doubt. There are many forms of animal life below those in which, to quote Professor Huxley once more, 'the nervous apparatus has reached no higher degree of development than that exhibited by the system of the spinal cord and the foundation of the brain in ourselves.' If, in regard to the latter, 'the argument from analogy leaves the assumption of the existence of any form of consciousness unsupported,' as the Professor maintains, it is clear that with regard to the former—that is to say, with regard at least to all invertebrate animals—we are shut up to the single argument from analogy. And in the case of invertebrate animals—

¹ Yet even canine psychology is far from being thoroughly explored. At any rate Sir John Lubbock does not think it is. He, it will be remembered, urges the repetition of his experiments in the way of teaching dogs written language, on the grounds that a means of communication being thus established between dog and man, the latter will be able to extend his knowledge of the ideas and feelings of the former.

insects, for instance, or slugs or worms—the argument from analogy itself is much more liable to failure for want of data, or to error in the interpretation of the data, than in the case of the higher vertebrata.

A moment's reflection will make the last statement clear. Wide as is the gulf between man and the highest brute in regard to the play of expression in exhibiting emotion, yet expression more or less intelligible to man can certainly be observed in the higher vertebrata. The muscles of the face are, indeed, not employed, or employed to a slight extent only, for the exhibition of joy. The orang-outang, for example, goes through his antics with the utmost gravity. There is but an approach to laughter in this and other anthropoid apes. He shows his susceptibility to the sensation of tickling by drawing down the corners of his mouth, grinning, and uttering a grunting sound. The chimpanzee titters, we are told, almost like a human being. In regard to pain the expression in the features of animals is more marked, and several species even shed tears, if we can trust Mr. Thompson, who remarks on the point:—

‘This has been noticed in the seal ; the giraffe, if separated from its companion, and the camel, if deprived of its foal, weep profusely; the elephant and several of the monkey tribe shed tears, and the horse particularly so, when violently excited or in suffering.’¹

The moralizing of Jaques over the wounded stag in ‘As You Like It’ will of course occur to the reader's mind ; but we cannot linger on the poetry of the subject. As regards facial expression the poverty of the brute when compared with man will be admitted. It is an interesting and suggestive point. We are rather surprised that Mr. Romanes has not dealt with the subject of expression in animals. He has probably reserved it for comparative treatment in the future work that is to deal with the evolution of the human mind. The readers, however, of Mr. Darwin's book on the subject will, we think, agree with us that an account of animal intelligence is incomplete that passes it by.

We shall not attempt to supply the omission. For our purpose it will suffice to point to the fact that many of the higher animals undoubtedly express a variety of emotions—*e.g.* fear, joy, rage, &c.—by particular attitudes, some also by the voice, and that we interpret these indications partly by the accompanying conduct of the animals, partly by the resemblance or analogy that we believe we can see to the move-

¹ See *The Passions of Animals*, pp. 102-7.

ments or the cries by which human beings, when unrestrained by self-consciousness, betray their emotions.

This common language of expression entirely fails us when we are studying the psychology of invertebrate animals. There are insects that assume strange attitudes which, however, we cannot dignify by the name of expression. We have no means of ascertaining whether any or what form of consciousness attends those attitudes. When, for example, the earwig turns backwards over its head its abdomen, armed with a threatening but harmless forceps, we cannot assert that either fear or anger is the cause. The *effect*, indeed, may be, as we are told, to create alarm amongst enemies. The attitude may amount to a *Noli me tangere*, but at the same time may not be any more a result of consciousness in the earwig than the markings on the coat of a vertebrate animal are of *its* consciousness. There is a giant caterpillar of North America, popularly styled the 'hickory-horned devil,' which is armed behind the head with seven or eight strong curved spines, half an inch or more in length. When disturbed it draws up its head, shaking or striking it from side to side, and so formidable is its aspect that, though it is incapable of inflicting an injury, few persons will venture to touch it.¹ In this case again, as in others which might be given, it is impossible to connect the peculiar attitude and movement with any definite psychological condition.

There is little else that can anyhow be brought under the head of expression in the invertebrate animals. Perhaps there is expression, but it is not of a nature intelligible to man. We are left to interpret as best we may the actions that we witness, without any index of their psychical accompaniment.

One of the first questions of comparative psychology will naturally be in what orders of animals may first be observed the presence of mental phenomena, the term mental being used in its widest sense as inclusive of all activities accompanied by consciousness, and exclusive of those that are merely reflex. Mere movement in an organism is not an adequate criterion; for there is movement in plants, and it requires a very robust faith to believe that any form of consciousness, however dim, is possessed by plants. Dr. Lauder Lindsay, indeed, the title of whose work on animals is given above, does not hesitate to maintain that plants feel; but, as will be seen presently, his views do not always appear justified by their reasonableness. Nor even though the movement be adaptive,

¹ See *Introduction to Entomology*, by Kirby and Spence (7th edition, 1856), p. 414.

even though it be apparently indicative of choice, are we always warranted in asserting that it is due to mind. Many such movements, due only to reflex action, are witnessed in living organisms. For example, a man may have received such an injury to the spine that the nervous connexion between the lower limbs and the brain is severed. Yet if the feet be tickled they will be suddenly drawn away, though the man himself is entirely unaware, unless informed by his eyes, both of the irritation and of the movement of his own limbs.¹

A further criterion is needed. The one insisted upon by Mr. Romanes appears to be the only one available. It will be best to give in his own words the summary of the results of his careful argument:—

'First, we found the Criterion of Mind to consist in the exhibition of Choice, and the evidence of Choice we found to consist in the performance of adaptive action suited to meet circumstances which have not been of such frequent or invariable occurrence in the life history of the race as to have been specially and antecedently provided for in the individual by the inherited structure of its nervous system. The power of learning by individual experience is, therefore, the Criterion of Mind.'²

We cannot now discuss Mr. Romanes's doctrine that mind shades off into not-mind by imperceptible degrees, and that consequently mind may be inferred to exist in organisms of a lower type than those which first supply evidence of its presence. The foregoing definition will probably command general assent. An animal that has mind can learn, and, conversely, an animal that can learn has mind. Doubtless the criterion has been employed by previous investigators with more or less of formal definition. To Mr. Romanes belongs the credit of fencing it with such safeguards as probably ensure the exclusion of error, provided the criterion be faithfully applied.

We could wish that he had firmly adhered to his own principle. When we apply to his pages in order to see at what point in the scale of life his criterion will allow us to assert the existence of mind, we must confess that he seems to us to attach more importance than we expected to other criteria. In his *Animal Intelligence* he consistently adheres to his principle. For example, though wonderful things are recorded of the movements of some even of the very lowest of the Protozoa (better known as *animalculæ*), he denies that these

¹ See *Animal Intelligence*, pp. 2, 3.

² See *Mental Evolution in Animals*, pp. 59, 60.

movements furnish any proof of mental action.¹ We believe he is right. The Cœlenterata, which include the well-known jelly fishes, and the Echinodermata, amongst which the star fishes are the most familiar, are dismissed with a like verdict. The presence in them of any psychical element is held to be not proved.²

Now, in the latter portion of his work,³ the jelly fishes are credited with having the 'raw material of consciousness,' an expression borrowed from Mr. Spencer and somewhat vague, which, perhaps, is covered by the doctrine already referred to of the gradual descent through mind to not-mind, a doctrine which Mr. Romanes regards as essential, we imagine, to his theory of the evolution of mind. Such a justification might appear to some persons to be an example of *petitio principii*. Mr. Romanes himself is a little uncomfortable about the position assigned in his scheme (which position he correctly describes as somewhat arbitrary; only we should prefer to call it purely arbitrary) to the Cœlenterata and Echinodermata. With regard to the latter we were certainly not prepared, after reading all he has to say on reflex action and all his cautions with regard to the criterion of mind, to find him saying—

'The Echinodermata' are represented in the scheme 'as having such an amount of consciousness as I think we may reasonably suppose they possess if we consider how multifarious and complicated their reflex actions have become, and if we remember that in their spontaneous movements the neuro-muscular adjustments which they exhibit almost present the appearance of being due to intelligence.'⁴

On referring to the scheme or diagram which faces the title page of the book, we find that the Echinodermata are credited with the possession of memory and of sensation in such a degree as to border quite closely on, if not actually to partake of, perception. For our part, having no theory to support of the rise of consciousness from reflex action, we are contented to profess a suspension of judgment with regard to the intellect and the emotions of star fishes. Whether consciousness ever rises out of reflex action we know not. We do know that reflex action has arisen in human experience out of conscious action. The most common example of this is, perhaps, the closure of the eyes on the sudden approach of a body that

¹ See *Animal Intelligence*, pp. 18-22.

² *Ibid.* pp. 22, 23.

³ *Animal Intelligence and Mental Evolution in Animals* are to be considered as portions of one work.

⁴ See *Mental Evolution in Animals*, p. 76.

might injure them. That this is really reflex action is strikingly proved by the fact that even in cases of paralysis the protective movement of the eyelids still takes place, although the patient cannot voluntarily close them. Yet it would be absurd to maintain that all true reflex action has arisen in this way. Consequently we are very far indeed from asserting the contrary of Mr. Romanes's doctrine, though we decline to avail ourselves of the bridge which he offers us from not-mind to mind.

We call particular attention to the fact that for the assignment to star fishes of the powers of consciousness indicated above a second criterion is adopted, viz. the multifariousness and complication of their reflex actions. Yet Mr. Romanes has no misgiving as to whether he has endowed them too highly. On a subsequent page he expresses a doubt whether he has quite done justice to them. He is not at all sure that he ought not to have placed them a stage higher in the psychological scale.¹

On that higher stage we find the *Annelida* ranged, which will not be surprising to those who have read the late Mr. Darwin's book on earthworms. We doubt whether the fact that worms dart back into their holes at the approach of footsteps really proves anything beyond reflex action. The suddenness and rapidity with which they do so would seem, on Mr. Romanes's own principles, to indicate action of this kind. But the cleverness which Mr. Darwin proved them to exhibit in fastening on to the most suitable parts of leaves to draw them down into their holes justifies possibly their title to possess instinct; and if instinctive action is, as we believe and Mr. Romanes maintains, conscious action, though not intelligently purposive action, worms in that case possess a sort of consciousness. Still we are not at all sure that a rigid application of the criterion formulated at the outset of the inquiry would not be fatal to their claims. At any rate nothing short of their ability to stand this test would prove their possession of intelligent purpose, with which Mr. Romanes is half inclined to credit them.

Intelligent purpose involves memory, and apart from the 'tolerable' evidence that star fishes have this power Mr. Romanes confesses that proof of it is not found until we reach a higher stage than any yet mentioned. We have ventured

¹ See *Mental Evolution in Animals*, p. 348. Mr. Romanes does introduce here, though it is strangely out of place, some evidence, which appears to us of very doubtful value, and which even he himself only ventures to call 'tolerable,' that star fishes actually possess 'faint powers of memory.'

to criticize some of his utterances, but his work is, in our judgment, by far the ablest attempt to establish comparative psychology on a worthy basis that has yet appeared, at any rate in England. An illustration of the want of scientific caution in some writers may be seen in their assertion that earth worms furnish positive proof of the possession of memory. Every schoolboy is aware that if he wants a supply of bait he has only to thrust a spade firmly into the ground, and on his then swaying it to and fro the worms, if any are concealed below, will emerge to the surface and rapidly move away. From this it has been inferred that the earth worm has an instinctive dread of moles, and that remembering the subterranean noise or movement caused by the mole in the process of tunnelling, it is alarmed by any similar phenomenon. The explanation we believe to be purely visionary and the inference unsound. Reflex action is quite sufficient to account for the movement, and it is easy to understand the capability of the miniature earthquake to stimulate reflex action in an animal entirely surrounded by the shaking earth. Moreover, similar effects are produced by other terrestrial movements. The lapwing can and does draw the worm to the surface by patting the ground, and other birds are said to be equally clever. An observation of our own made while this paper was in hand confirmed our opinion. It happened that the point of a penknife was employed to break the crusted surface of soil in a flower pot, when on a sudden a large worm wriggled out and with astonishing rapidity found its way over the side of the pot. We can hardly believe that such varied earth shakings agree in resembling those produced by the movements of the mole, but they may very conceivably agree in their power to stimulate reflex action, while the fact that when a worm is cut in half both sections retain the power of motion shows how completely the body of the worm is provided with the machinery of reflex action.

The foregoing remarks will serve to illustrate the difficulty indicated by us as lying on the threshold of the study of mind in animals. Another difficulty arises from the want of trustworthy data, or perhaps rather from the abundance of testimony, which, to say the least, is of very doubtful nature. While not confining ourselves to this point we shall introduce examples in illustration of it.

The lowest animals that furnish positive proof of possessing memory are among the *Mollusca*. The oyster has no head, but it can be educated. It scarcely needs to be said that though for educational capacity memory is not everything its

total absence would render the schoolmaster's work absolutely hopeless. It may be a surprise to some to hear of oyster schools; nevertheless they exist. The oyster has but to learn one very simple lesson, and it does learn it perfectly. The oysters, whose habitat is below low-water mark, are never uncovered by the sea, and consequently are perfectly reckless about opening their shells. When first brought to land on the coast of France they are kept in reservoirs, where they are gradually trained to bear a longer exposure to the air without gaping until they can be trusted to keep their shells closed during the time occupied in the journey to Paris.¹ The claim of the oyster to possess some power of memory is, we think, satisfactorily made out.

So far we go along with Mr. Romanes in his estimate of mollusc psychology. But what can be said of the following narrative? Two snails, one of which, it appears, was in delicate health, were placed in a small and ill-provided garden. After a short time the healthy one was missing, but its track could be followed over the wall into a well-stocked garden. Twenty-four hours later it returned to its friend, and then both started on the same track and disappeared over the garden wall.² We venture to say that before we can be induced to believe that one of two snails, having been separated from its companion during twenty-four hours, retained so lively a recollection of it and of the place where it was left behind, and experienced so much unselfish sympathy as to undertake a toilsome journey in order to bring the other to share in the discovered abundance, we require corroboration in the shape of similar narratives. These, however, are unfortunately absent, and their absence in regard to a species of animals so common and so easy to observe is significant. Mr. Romanes, we should add, does not guarantee the truth of the facts, much less the correctness of the interpretation suggested. In our opinion it is a pity that he introduces the story, and we are surprised that the late Mr. Darwin should have thought it worthy of a place in his *Descent of Man*. For Mr. Romanes there is the excuse to be made that he seemed bound to give the utmost possible value to a narrative endorsed by such a name, though in this case Mr. Darwin himself was not the observer. Moreover, the story fits in so badly with Mr. Romanes's scheme that if he followed his own inclination he would probably have left it out.

No similar excuse can be made for some of the retailers

¹ See *Animal Intelligence*, p. 25.

² *Animal Intelligence*, pp. 27, 28.

of wonderful anecdotes of the performances of animals. We do not point this remark at such a book as Houzeau's *Études sur les Facultés Mentales des Animaux comparées à celles de l'Homme*, which is the most complete, temperate, and sensible account of animal intelligence that we have met with. It is methodical, lucid as French writers know how to make their expositions of scientific subjects, and all this without any sacrifice of the interest that belongs to the subject. Nor do we regard Dr. Brehm's *Bird Life* as offering a fair mark for severe criticism. The writer aimed only at evoking sympathy in behalf of his feathered clients, and, being free from the temptations that beset the theorizer, produced a book that is full of interest without the aid of fictitious narrative or fanciful explanation. The author and the translators alike pointedly disclaim in behalf of the work any pretensions to high scientific rank. The latter recommend it, and justly, on the ground of its usefulness in popularizing a kind of knowledge that will prove the antidote to cruelty, while they only vouch for the general accuracy of 'the main proportion of the information contained therein.'¹

We have a right to expect performance of a much higher standard in a work consisting of two thick volumes, set forth with all the parade of a lengthy bibliography of works consulted, with appendices and index, and in which the apparently exhaustive and methodical divisions and subdivisions of each portion of the subject tax the reader's patience to the uttermost. This is an accurate description of Dr. Lauder Lindsay's work on *Mind in the Lower Animals*. That portions of the work have considerable value we are far from denying; but the author is carried away by his eagerness to prove the identity of the mental attributes of the brute with those of man. He certainly admits narratives and interpretations of narratives about animals that seriously detract from the scientific value of his book.

As examples of topics of an interesting nature which are handled by Dr. Lindsay—not very unsatisfactorily, though we should be sorry to vouch for the historical truth of all his instances—we may point to his chapter on 'Intoxication' as it is exemplified in the animal world, and to his notice of the fact that insanity or mental imbecility in an animal is sometimes perceived by its animal friends before man discovers it. In regard to the latter point he quotes a case (already given by Houzeau) of an imbecile dog pup, whose mother was

¹ See *Bird Life*, Translators' Preface.

the first to discover its mental inferiority to its brother pups, and, recognizing its helplessness, supplied it specially with food.¹ A proneness to alcoholic inebriation, we regret to find, occurs 'in a considerable number and variety of animals, from among the lowest to the highest.' Even the *Medusa* (a kind of jelly fish) exhibits this depraved taste, according to Dr. Lindsay, though we should certainly decline to see in the undoubted effects of stimulants upon this lowly organism any proof of a 'love' for spirituous liquors. We see, however, no reason for doubting the truth of his remark that 'most domestic and pet animals, many menagerie ones, and many wild ones, representing the quadrumana, quadrupeds and birds, in various ways acquire so strong a liking for spirits of various kinds that they indulge their appetite whenever opportunity offers.'² The inference that we draw from this truth, assuming it to be one, is that when a human being drinks to excess he more literally lowers himself to the level of the brute, destitute as the latter must be of a sense of the degradation of being intoxicated, than has generally been supposed. The advocate of total abstinence has been known to point to the irrational creature as a model of temperance. As a matter of fact the real lesson to be learnt from all the facts is that in this particular, as in others, man desecrates and degrades a higher nature by refusing obedience to the motives for self-restraint which he certainly has and of which the animal is destitute. For though we do not, with Sydney Smith, deny to animals the possession of all foresight, it is abundantly clear that their power in this respect is very limited indeed. Man errs in full view of the consequences. Consequently his very errors differentiate him from the rest of the creation. Why nature should have so exceptionally gone wrong in him is a question unexplained by science; but it is explained by the religious view that the abuse of freewill has disordered the psychology of the human race.

Dr. Lindsay's want of scientific caution is revealed at a very early stage of the exposition of mind in animals. Mr. Romanes, as has been stated above, denies that the Protozoa, wonderful as are their movements, exhibit proof of mental action. Not so Dr. Lindsay. He almost exhausts the vocabulary of mental attributes in describing their powers, declaring that there is in 'the lowest sub-kingdom of the invertebrata—the Protozoa of zoologists,' an exhibition of 'will, determination, fixed purpose or aim, intention, cunning, ingenuity in the adaptation of means to an end, the recognition

¹ See *Mind in the Lower Animals*, vol. ii. p. 29.

² *Ibid.* p. 82.

of food and the selection thereof.' 'Here then we have,' he sums up, 'at the very base or beginning of the zoological scale, in the capture of prey a whole series of mental phenomena exhibited—will, purpose, choice, ingenuity, observation, feeling—and these aptitudes doubtless involve others' (it would be very remarkable, by the way, if they did not), 'such as sensation and consciousness (!), patience and perseverance.'¹ And these are animals, be it remembered, in which no traces can be discovered of nerve tissue. After such an estimate of the Protozoa it is an example of comparative moderation to say of the *Gasteropoda* (slugs, snails, &c.), which have a well-defined nervous system, that in them 'pairing is preceded by courtship; they contract attachments, and there is association of ideas.'²

One more specimen of this author's views will probably suffice to convince the reader that he is not to be trusted as an interpreter of the animal world.

He is doubtless only stating the truth, with regard at least to mammals and birds, when he asserts that animals are subject to mental disorders of a serious nature besides rabies, as well as to minor disorders, such as illusions.³ The fact is quite sufficient to account for such cases of suicide on the part of cats and dogs as find their way from time to time into the newspapers.⁴ Whether in any particular case we should conceive the instinct of self-preservation as having been in abeyance, or that the animal was the victim of some illusion, it might not be possible to say. But it is an outrage upon common sense to speak as Dr. Lindsay does of an animal's 'self-destruction—deliberate, intentional, the result of choice and consideration.' His exposition of the subject has, we regret to say, a comic effect. The animal, he declares, 'is almost invariably old,' and 'age leads to a full knowledge of the trials or troubles of life.' It 'may suffer from wounded feelings,' such as 'despair of forgiveness by man,' 'a broken heart,' 'disgust, and jealousy,' 'or it may be simply blind, deaf, or paralysed.' Amongst the 'circumstances of suicide' which he methodically enumerates we find 'choice of a minor rather than of a major evil,' 'formation of a plan of suicide,' 'resolution or determination in carrying out that plan involving

¹ See *Mind in the Lower Animals*, vol. i. p. 52.

² *Ibid.* p. 62.

³ Mr. Romanes gives a singular illustration of monomania in a pigeon, which, whenever a certain ginger-beer bottle was placed in his way, approached it with the most ludicrous demonstrations of homage and affection. See *Mental Evolution in Animals*, p. 173.

⁴ See an example in the *Pall Mall Gazette* for Monday, February 25 last, p. 4.

repeated efforts if obstacles are interposed,' 'refusal of all means of help,' 'farewell-taking by look or otherwise of familiar and loved scenes, persons, or objects.'¹

The absurdity of all this is almost too patent to require argument. It is obvious that if animals were capable of taking in the situation, as he describes them, of pondering Hamlet's famous question, 'to be or not to be,' and of realizing how easy it would be to put an end to their sufferings, suicide would be much more frequent amongst them than even Dr. Lindsay declares it to be. *A fortiori* might we expect this to be the case if we accepted the view propounded at the close of the text of his second volume:—

'Nor, indeed, is there good ground for doubting that animals can communicate their morbid as well as their healthy feelings. Why should we believe for a moment that the free and full intercommunication of ideas, feelings, wants, wishes, is confined to their normal expression?'²

We have given more space than they deserve to Dr. Lindsay's views on the suicide of animals. Whatever of importance belongs to them arises from the attempt on his part to fill up the broad gulf between man and brute, to refute what he calls the error of 'artificial differentiation of animal from human intelligence.'³ Still, before Mr. Romanes had made the subject his own, Dr. Lindsay's work occupied the field as the most comprehensive in range and ambitious in aim of recent books by English authors. The reader is now in a position to judge for himself whether we have exaggerated the second difficulty which the student of mind in animals has had to encounter.

In Mr. Romanes's account of Animal Intelligence we mark, to use the language of evolutionists, if not the first appearance of a conscience with regard to the admission or rejection of evidence, a clear recognition of the want of some guiding principles in the matter. The reader who may desire to know what principles Mr. Romanes lays down must refer to his preface. But we are tempted to ask on reading his stories whether even he has not sometimes opened the door a little too wide. Let the reader judge from the following specimen which he quotes (without giving the reference) from Bingley, a writer who has been dead more than half a century and who himself only gives the story at second hand:—

'Mr. Wildman, whose remarks on the management of bees are well known, possessed a secret by which he could at any time cause a

¹ See *Mind in the Lower Animals*, vol. ii. p. 130 seq.

² *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 395.

³ *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 3.

hive of bees to swarm upon his head, shoulders, or body, in a most surprising manner. He has been seen to drink a glass of wine with the bees all over his head and face more than an inch deep. Several fell into the glass, but did not sting him. He could even act the part of a general with them, by marshalling them in battle array on a large table. Then he divided them into regiments, battalions, and companies, according to military discipline, waiting only for his word of command. The moment he uttered the word "March" they began to march in a very regular manner in rank and file like soldiers. To these, his Lilliputians, he also taught so much politeness that they never attempted to sting any of the numerous company which, at different times, resorted to admire this singular spectacle.¹

It may be remarked that if this story were substantiated Mr. Romanes would have to modify his views at least in one particular. Bees are here represented as understanding words. That there may be no doubt on this point it should be stated that the passage is so referred to in the index. Yet, both in the diagram which faces the title-page of *Mental Evolution in Animals* and in the text of the same book (p. 351) the power of understanding words is represented as first appearing at the higher psychological stage occupied by birds.

We resist the temptation to introduce any of the well authenticated and interesting anecdotes of the higher animals which may be found in the works cited at the head of this article. Even so, little space is left us for comment on the theory of mental evolution which Mr. Romanes endeavours to substantiate. An opportunity will, however, be afforded for dealing fully with it when his promised volume is published in which he purposes to crown the edifice with an account of the human mind. Our remarks, therefore, on the present occasion will be brief.

At the outset the reader will scarcely fail to notice the adroitness with which our author presents his solution of the problem of mind. Hitherto we had thought that the doctrine of Evolution by Natural Selection was to be regarded as a whole—as an explanation of the origin of all existing forms of life under all their aspects, physical, mental, moral—and that all would stand or fall together. Now, even instinct alone, all other psychical facts apart, has been generally admitted to involve difficulties for the extreme evolutionist, though of course not regarded by him as insuperable. Mr. Darwin understood the rise of instincts to constitute an integral portion of his problem, and that he recognized the additional *onus* thus laid upon him is clear from his remark, 'Many instincts are so

¹ See *Animal Intelligence*, p. 189.

wonderful that their development will probably appear to the reader a difficulty sufficient to overthrow my whole theory.¹

Mr. Romanes knows the value of the motto '*Divide et impera.*' If it were not for the tremendous importance of the psychological part of the theory the merely physical part would not necessarily excite opposition. It is the former which furnishes both the motive for disliking the theory and many of the intellectual grounds for disputing it. Obviously, therefore, it is an advantage for a champion of the theory to have it believed that there are two classes of opponents—on the one hand those who dispute the physical side of it, on the other those who dispute the psychological—and to make short work with the latter by implying that they are involved in the defeat of the former. Instead of presenting the theory as a whole Mr. Romanes claims to bring in *mental evolution* as the corollary of *organic evolution*. It is like the difference between an attempt made by two persons to enter a narrow doorway abreast, and by the same two to enter one behind the other. For ourselves, however great the force of the arguments for development (and it is very great) as the *method* of creation, we decline to fall down and worship natural selection as the omnipotent creator.*

Far different has been the belief which throughout the past history of man, so far as that can be known or even conjectured, has acted as a moral lever supporting and continually elevating him far above the animal world. And we are not without the plainest warnings of the terrible condition in which our race would be involved were natural selection to expel from His throne in the human heart the Divine Creator and Ruler. We picture to ourselves, in that case, some future social philosopher contemplating the ruins of the moral grandeur of our race and saying, 'In the course of his life upon this planet man somehow came to believe in the existence of a Power above and beyond all that was visible, above and beyond the solar system and all solar systems, a Being ineffably wise, ineffably loving, ineffably glorious, who was man's Creator, Ruler, Father, Guide, and Judge; who, though unseen by the eye of sense, was felt to be the great Reality, the Foundation of all reality, the Absolute Truth and Beauty and Love; whose reflexion the finite being saw, or thought he saw, around and within himself, and continually strove to discover more clearly and realize more fully in science, in art, and in religion. This belief had an effect upon man to which

¹ See *Origin of Species*, p. 205, 6th ed.

no other impulse can be compared that any organic being has been susceptible of. It lifted him up above himself. It inspired him with feelings and hopes that made all unselfish toil for others, all self-sacrifice, of no account to him. It was as sunshine to him throughout his life, and a never-failing cordial in death. But this belief and all its beneficent results have vanished or are vanishing. If it be not moral stagnation that reigns amongst us now it is downward movement; and, since the force which elevated mankind has ceased to act, the present condition can only escape being moral stagnation by reason of the lowest state of degradation not yet having been reached. In this case the words of the Roman poet are more fatally true than they formerly proved to be:—

“*Damnosa quid non imminuit dies !
Ætas parentum, pejor avis, tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturos
Progeniem vitiosiore.*”

Such reflections will inevitably occupy the serious thinker of a future day if religious faith be now trampled underfoot. And it is well to remember that the gloomy anticipations of the Roman poet were only not realized finally because a bright new day of whose dawn he could not discover the slightest promise was on the point of breaking. His limited horizon may excuse his despairing tone. From us it is certain that no *oceanus dissociabilis* conceals any unsuspected possibilities of such a moral and spiritual renovation as that effected by Christianity. *Merses profundo, pulchrior evenit*, cannot be applied here to humanity. Religion, in the interest of all that is true, honest, just, pure, lovely, in the interest of every virtue worthy of the name, cannot but be possessed with—

‘the fear lest this her realm, uprear’d,
By noble deeds at one with noble vows,
From flat confusion and brute violence,
Reel back into the beast, and be no more.’

ART. III.—JAMES SKINNER.

James Skinner: a Memoir. By the Author of
Charles Lowder. (London, 1883.)

THE volume before us is from the pen of the same accomplished authoress who has rendered so important a service to the Church by the publication of the Memoir of Charles Lowder, reviewed in the CHURCH QUARTERLY for April 1882. It is interesting to compare the two books. Miss Trench (there is no reason, we believe, for denying ourselves the pleasure of giving her name) had never met Mr. Lowder, but had been on terms of intimate friendship with Mr. Skinner, under whose roof, as she tells us, she wrote an important part of her former volume. In that work she undertook to narrate, from such sources of information as were open to her, and largely on the authority of Mr. Skinner himself, a great conflict, waged, in part, for what is inaccurately called 'ritual,' but far more for religion itself, in the face of an opposition of which the original and dominant motives were even then manifest to all who had not shut their eyes. In this latter respect, the life of Charles Lowder is 'a book of the wars of the Lord.' *Vexilla Regis prodeunt.* We see the muster of 'Moabites and Hagarenes,' and 'Assur helping the children of Lot:' the 'adversaries' literally 'roar in the midst of the congregation;' it is a struggle in which nothing but the courage born of faith can hold out against odds which at first seem overwhelming, and which does at last end in a true 'victory over the world,' secured by the experiences of a terrible period of pestilence, and proclaimed unmistakably, long afterwards, by such a funeral as London had never seen. Mr. Skinner's career has, of course, points of resemblance with Mr. Lowder's, but it has not the same dramatic completeness, the same thrill and pulsation of unrelenting militant energy. The authoress sees in the one life 'a victory through self-denying action,' in the other 'a victory mainly through suffering.' And if the present volume, necessarily falls short of its predecessor in a peculiar kind of interest, it excels not only in lessons of devout patience, under the sore trial of radically unsound health, but also in positive spiritual teaching, which faces realities and descends into particulars, inasmuch as several pages are made up of extracts from Mr. Skinner's letters of moral and religious counsel. Of his help-

fulness in this direction we will presently give some specimens ; but now let us look at the general story of his life.

It is curious to have to associate the curate of S. Barnabas, Pimlico, and the Vicar of Newland with the name of Robert Burns and the old Scotch song of 'Tullochgorum's my delight.' James Skinner was, in fact, the great-grandson of a man remarkable among the single-hearted and much enduring clergy of the Scottish Church during the period of her depression under the anti-Jacobite penal laws of the last century.¹ Readers of Principal Shairp's *Life of Burns* may remember how the poet, when in his twenty-ninth year, made acquaintance with Bishop Skinner of Aberdeen,

'and when he learnt that the Bishop's father, the author of the song of "Tullochgorum," and "the Ewie wi' the crookit horn," and other songs, was still alive, an aged Episcopalian clergyman, living in primitive simplicity in "a but and a ben" at Lishart, in the parish of Longside, near Peterhead, and that on his way to Aberdeen he had passed near the place without knowing it, Burns expressed the greatest regret at having missed seeing the author of songs he so greatly admired.'

and that afterwards a correspondence (of which Miss Trench gives some examples) passed between Burns and the good pastor of Longside, whom he owned as an elder 'brother.' This was in 1787. Thirty-four years earlier, John Skinner had been imprisoned at Aberdeen for officiating in presence of 'more than four persons besides his own family.' He continued for twenty years afterwards in the charge which he had held since 1733, and died quite suddenly, aged eighty-six, in the house of his son, then 'Primus' of the Scottish Episcopate, June 16, 1807. Miss Trench does not mention the fact that he was the author of an *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, from the Reformation to the death of Prince Charles Edward, which he dedicated in Latin to 'his son and Bishop.' Bishop John Skinner was the father of Bishop William Skinner, also 'Primus,' and of John Skinner, Dean of Dunkeld, and incumbent of S. John's, Forfar, who also was present at his death, and who, nine years afterwards, became the father of James Skinner. It may as well be remembered that the wife of the first John Skinner was the daughter of another stout-hearted northern priest, John Hunter, who represented the Church in Shetland from 1734 to 1761, visiting assiduously 'from the Fair Isle,' between Orkney and Shetland 'to the

¹ We may mention that 'A Life of the Rev. John Skinner, Dean of Aberdeen, and author of *Tullochgorum*,' has recently been published by the Rev. W. Walker, of Monymusk. (London, Skeffington, 1883.)

island of Yell,' all but the most northerly in the Shetland group (we quote a useful little *History of the Episcopal Church in Orkney*, by the Rev. J. B. Craven, of Kirkwall), and whose labours are commemorated in the present church of S. Magnus, at Lerwick. Thus James Skinner by right inherited the characteristic qualities of resolute Scottish Churchmanship. We do not, in fact, understand him unless we remember these native antecedents. They led him, as he himself, in 1841, expressed it to Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce, 'to divest Catholic truth of all alloying external influences prevalent in this Erastian age' (p. 20), and they should be taken account of whenever his attitude on Church questions may be thought too rigid, an opinion which even the ardent friendship of the authoress for her hero does not pronounce groundless, for she admits (p. 93) that 'at times men' thought him 'too stern and unbending,' and that 'the world knew little of the tenderness that was combined with an iron will, or how a soft answer could in a moment turn his most eager moods into gentleness.' Dr. Pusey, we are told, quoted in regard to him—

'Come one, come all, this rock shall fly
From its firm base, as soon as I' (p. 28).

There is, after all, a certain hardness in the Scotch character; and the sufferings of the northern Church, acting on Scotch natures, would naturally develop a somewhat rugged type of ecclesiastical virtue. There is a significance in the first lines of Isaac Williams's sonnet on 'The Church in Scotland' in *The Cathedral*—

'More pure the gale where the wild thistle rears
His mountain banner on his stony tower,
Than odorous breath of cultivated bower.'

Modern Scottish Churchmanship, we sometimes fear, has had a little too much of this iron taken out of its blood. But to return to our biography. He went to school, and then to the Marischal College at Aberdeen, and afterwards, when only fifteen, to the University of Durham, where his 'habits, at first, were quite the reverse of studious.' He was fond of amusement, of society, of debating; at the end of each term he shut himself up, to read for the impending examination; he took a second class in 1836, and in 1840 became a Fellow of the University. But he was conscious 'that he had wasted much valuable time.' We read of his making a fervid speech at a meeting of the Scotch Episcopal Friendly Society. He

was for nearly two years a master at King William's College in the Isle of Man, where, according to one of his pupils, he impressed even 'rough raw lads by his dignified kindly courtesy, his polished mannerism' (*i.e.* manner?), 'and earnest devoutness,' and his farewell words to them were significant—'Never forget your Mother the Church.' He published a pamphlet 'On the Observance of Lent' in 1840, and fulfilled the long-settled purpose of his heart by receiving ordination in 1841. His 'title' was given by Archdeacon Wilberforce, who showed him the utmost kindness; but, soon after he was ordained priest, happened the first of those collapses of health which form, so to speak, the landmarks of this biography, and which make one wonder that he nevertheless attained his sixty-fourth year. This illness, we are told, was probably due not merely to delicacy of constitution, but to excessive fasting: in regard to which observance he said long afterwards, that at that early time he was his own guide, and 'made an uncommonly bad' one (p. 21). During part of 1845 he was curate of a district church at Windsor, where he learned to deal with soldiers, and where the unbalanced intensity of his teaching about sin after baptism received some moderating checks from Dr. Pusey. It was the time at which the Church of England encountered, through the secession of Mr. Newman, that shipwreck of brilliant hopes which Mr. Gladstone, in 1868, described in his *Chapter of Autobiography*. James Skinner, in his stringent fashion, spoke then of this and similar secessions as 'apostasies,' but vindicated Dr. Pusey's refusal to pass on them any 'public condemnation.' It is curious to read the two names which he associates with Dr. Pusey's as staunch to the English Church—'Hook and Manning.' He thought that 'our wise plan as to Rome was to leave her alone . . . we did not cast *her* off so much as she cast off *us*: the advance must be made by her, therefore,' &c. (p. 29). After some work as chaplain of a military prison, where he memorialized the War Secretary as to certain hindrances to Christian efforts among soldiers, and some further ministrations at S. Mary's, Reading, where with his fellow-curate he lodged in an unhealthy lane in order to live among the poor, his health again broke down, and he accepted from Mr. Gleig (himself the son of a learned Scottish prelate) 'the post of chaplain to the forces at Corfu.'

In this office he passed four years, and the record of them is, in one sense, the most inspiring portion of this narrative. Certainly it is the story of a remarkable success. The Chaplain-General, in 1847, writes to him, 'You are a man after

my own heart. . . . The reports which I receive of you from all quarters . . . make me glad. I thank God that you are what you are.' Long afterwards, Mr. Gleig wrote of him as of one who had passed away, 'He was a noble fellow: a little too stern, in my opinion, as a Churchman, for the age in which he was born, but worthy of all esteem as a man of the purest life, and the most unbending principle;' and went on to speak of the improvement which had been effected through his means in the conduct of the regiments at Corfu. What is still more to the purpose, Field-Marshal Lord Seaton wrote thus after resigning his office as Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands in 1849:

'I believe that no chaplain ever discharged his duties with greater profit to the soldiers than he did during the time I was in command on that station' (p. 65).

Our authoress may well say, 'Mr. Skinner must have been a very congenial chaplain to soldiers, because he had so much of a soldier spirit himself. . . . The men felt they had to do with a strong man, and they respected him accordingly.'

And his example taught a yet broader lesson as to the sympathy between true religion and true manliness. It thus illustrated what Dean Church has so beautifully set forth, the effect of Christianity in 'consolidating, elevating, and refining the old manliness of the Teutonic race;' and supplied a refutation of the oft-repeated taunt that religion is but a pious form of effeminacy. His letters of this period contain several curious particulars as to the Greek Church usages, which seem to have resembled the Roman type more closely than is the case in Russia. These years have also a special and pathetic interest, for they include an interval of leave, during which he married Miss Agnes Raymond, to whom he had been engaged since 1839, and to whom, at the close of thirty-three years of 'blessed' union he could say, 'This life has no attraction for me beyond yourself; you are my only tie' (pp. 334, 383). Ill-health was, as usual, the cause of his leaving this attractive sphere of duty. Ill-health, again, prevented him from entering on an incumbency in his native Scottish Church. But he was well enough, in the spring of 1851, to enter on a charge which gave him considerable prominence in that 'second stage of the Oxford movement,' which in 1881 he defined as having been devoted to 'the application of fixed theological principles to the practice of morals and public worship' (p. 92). This charge was the senior curacy of S. Barnabas, Pimlico. Our review of

¹ *The Gifts of Civilization*, &c. pp. 329, 332.

the Memoir of Charles Lowder has traversed, to some extent, the ground over which, from this point, the present volume conducts its readers; nor shall we now dwell at length on a story which is in one point of view humiliating, and in another encouraging, and which our authoress estimates as belonging to 'a struggle of which we are far from seeing the end.' But, not to leave a blank, we will just notice one or two features of that contest. Mr. Skinner, with characteristic tenacity of purpose, contended for what he deemed the moral right of the congregation of S. Barnabas to certain observances which, he fully admitted, might not suit the worshippers of the mother church of S. Paul, Knightsbridge. He opposed a tender passive resistance to his truly estimable vicar, who feared that any specialties maintained at S. Barnabas might bring him into a difficulty with Bishop Blomfield. 'There are things,' wrote Mr. Liddell, 'in which my parishioners, the Church at large, and our diocesan, will and must hold *me*, not *you*, responsible;' and for a time he urged Mr. Skinner to yield all the points of difference between S. Paul's and S. Barnabas' except that of the choral service at the latter. Mr. Skinner, on the other hand, insisted on adhering 'to *the one* line of administration with which he had set out' (p. 88). Be it observed that the question turned, not on vestments or incense, but on such matters as the placing of flowers on the altar, the turning eastward at 'Gloria Patri,' and the chanting of the 'Sanctus' and the 'Gloria in excelsis.' Instead of S. Barnabas' conforming to the use of S. Paul's, 'it was the services at S. Paul's which in respect of every point of dispute were assimilated to those of S. Barnabas' (p. 91). As Mr. Skinner might have expressed it, instead of the mother drawing the daughter down, it was the daughter that drew the mother up. She had the stronger wrist of the two.

'*It's dogged as does it*,' says one of Mr. Trollope's characters, —and Mr. Skinner illustrates the aphorism. The latter part of his time at S. Barnabas was, indeed, saddened by the judgment of Dr. Lushington in 'Westerton v. Liddell,' a judgment of which he naturally speaks with great severity (p. 171); but not more severely than the *Christian Remembrancer* for January 1846, which declared 'the principles set up by the judge' to be 'antagonistic to the essence of the Church of England,' as 'a portion of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.' Certainly one can now afford to smile at a ruling which forbade any variation of altar cloths according to seasons, and the erection of a cross, *as such*, above the holy table—and which solemnly described Bishop

Butler's conduct in this respect as 'a beacon on high, to warn us all from the dangers of so perilous a course!' Mr. Skinner dwells affectionately, in the paper just referred to, on Mr. Liddell's successful appeal to the Judicial Committee, but, of course, adds the salvo that 'we are not concerned with the fitness of that tribunal to sit upon spiritual and ecclesiastical subjects.' He quotes the judgment which was then given and, of course, dwells on the dictum in favour of the present legality of 'the same dresses, and the same utensils or articles, which were used under the first Prayer Book of Edward VI.' Mr. Beresford Hope reminded us, ten years ago, that 'this judgment was the unanimous decision, in the year 1857, of one of the strongest courts which ever sat as a Judicial Committee.' He regards the judgment, in regard to the points immediately before it, as 'the Magna Charta of more artistic forms of worship on the older lines;' but, besides this, he emphasizes the fact that the dictum above cited gave a sanction to 'the vestments so called,' as prescribed by the Prayer Book of 1549.¹

But before this famous appeal was decided, another failure of health constrained Mr. Skinner to leave S. Barnabas. He tried hard to avoid the necessity, but Mr. Liddell himself plainly told him that he ought to go, being 'disabled by the sovereign will of God.' This was by no means his first experience of illness at S. Barnabas. Once he had to be carried in an invalid chair to make his Communion. Soon afterwards, in the autumn of 1854, he went to the East, and in his journey across the desert had the sorrowful duty of ministering to the last spiritual needs of a brother-clergyman and fellow-traveller. After he finally quitted S. Barnabas, he went with his wife to the Riviera, but came back looking 'almost like a dying man' (p. 187). In October of 1859 we find him living near London, and organizing the English Church Union in concert with the Hon. Colin Lindsay, who in 1882, long after his own secession from the Church of England, spoke of his old friend as having had 'the largest share in the foundation and development' of that society, and added with touching tenderness: 'My meeting him again' (in 1881) 'revived all my earlier affection for him, and I mourned for him when it pleased God to take him. Daily do I pray for his soul, for I believe he always acted in perfect good faith towards God and His Church' (p. 195).

Again he went abroad in 1860, and in his letters he dwelt, not without humour, on the crucifix, lights, and eastward

¹ *Worship in the Church of England*, pp. 35, 60.

position as exhibited at Breslau by the representatives of 'the traditional Protestantism of 1529,' and with great sadness on the contempt and disbelief which ecclesiastical 'corruption through error and extravagance' had generated among the educated laity of the Roman Church. But we fail to appreciate the comparison between foreign Catholics and Protestants as to their habitual pleasure-making on Sunday.

'Catholics may exceed in their Sunday pleasures, but they do not please themselves at the cost of their religious profession. The Protestants of Zurich both exceed in their pleasures and set their religious profession at defiance. I believe that the profession of Protestantism at Zurich is the profession of no religion at all' (p. 196).

Not to say that the last of these sentences can hardly be reconciled with its predecessor, it appears that the Protestants, on Mr. Skinner's showing, had a stricter theory of Sunday observance than the Catholics.

The eleventh chapter of the book introduces us to Mr. Skinner's life at Newland, near Malvern, as vicar of the little parish and first warden of the Beauchamp Almshouses, a twofold office which he held from the autumn of 1861 to that of 1877. Newland was the truest home he ever had; and his life there, although sadly overclouded in 1868 by the death of his beloved daughter and only child, a girl of remarkable promise, was on the whole peacefully happy. His official house was not ready until two years after he entered upon office; and the new church, and the almshouses of which it was also to be the chapel, were not opened until the July of 1864.

Many of our readers will know this exquisite group of buildings, which are about two miles distant from Great Malvern, and of which, the authoress tells us, Bishop Forbes said that they were 'like a bit of the Middle Ages let down amongst us.' She herself enthusiastically describes the quadrangle as presenting 'what almost seems an enchanted scene, a very paradise of peaceful and holy delight. . . . Here, in this home of devotion and charity, a season of such happiness and beautiful brightness, was granted to the warden and his household as is seldom the lot of God's servants on earth.' Indeed, the first summer after his arrival was marked by a very enjoyable visit to Oxford for the *second* Church Congress (not the first, as the authoress reckons it). He narrates it with delightful humour, occasionally descending to such a colloquialism as 'lots of friends, most jolly;' he fully appreciates the tact of Bishop Wilberforce in averting a dangerous discussion, describes a 'grand choral celebration' in Merton Chapel, 'Ser-

jeant celebrant' (the name of that excellent Fellow of Merton, still dear to memory, was Sargent), appreciates the 'good-humoured chaff' of Archdeacon Denison, and naively records that he dined at All Souls' 'with F. L.' (the present Earl Beauchamp) where the ale was of tremendous power, quite beyond me' (p. 212).

His rustic parishioners appear to have been singularly responsive to his teaching. He used to tell them, by pastoral letters, what he meant to do, and what he wished or invited them to do. He began, of course, by increasing the celebrations, and when the new church was opened they became weekly, and from the Easter Day of 1868, 'there has never been a day when the showing forth of the Lord's death, has not been made at the altar of Newland church' (p. 276). He adopted the use of linen vestments, after due explanation to his people, at Christmas, 1867. At the following Easter these were exchanged for silken ones, which he continued to wear 'without the least opposition either from Bishop or parishioners.' He was frequently consulted on spiritual questions and on ecclesiastical difficulties, and Newland became in this way a sort of centre of attraction for younger clergymen who sympathized with Mr. Skinner's theological views, who relied on his experience as an adviser, or who came as temporary curates 'to learn and to read before undertaking larger work.' We are told that Mr. Skinner believed 'that during the first year or two of priesthood' a curacy 'which gave leisure for thought and study was the most profitable in the end' (p. 223). He was ever ready to give conferences, conduct retreats, and do other miscellaneous work of that kind; thus Canon Carter, in the preface which he has written for this volume, says that 'he was never unoccupied, except when quite unequal to any exertion.' And that was apparently too often the case; his life became, as he grew older, more than ever a life of suffering and compulsory inaction. At last his ill-health drove him out of this haven of refuge, as it had formerly disabled him from work at Burton Agnes, at Reading, in Corfu, and in London. In the autumn of 1876, having ascertained 'that he could never again hope to work through a winter at Newland,' he consulted the Bishop of Worcester as to the propriety of resigning the benefice. The Bishop, with his unvarying kindness, deprecated the project, and offered leave of absence for the winter. 'But the trustees of the almshouses refused' to do the like, and thereby constrained Mr. Skinner to contemplate resignation of the wardenship. He got 'a few weeks' leave' in February 1877,

in order 'to try the baths at Bristol,' returning, to all appearances, 'in better condition;' but the improvement did not continue so as to give him a prospect of spending a winter at Newland' (p. 328). Our authoress, as a devoted friend of the warden, does not give us the trustees' point of view, but quotes with evident sympathy part of a letter of Dr. Pusey, who went so far as to compare the trustees to Godfrey Bertram expelling the gipsies from their huts at Ellangowan:

'Do you remember that outburst of Meg Merrilies to Bertram, who had deprived her tribe of their home? I ever thought it very eloquent and touching. It was done *then*. I wish there were a Meg Merrilies to say it to the trustees before it is done' (p. 329).

It could not have occurred to Dr. Pusey that the 'tribe' was much addicted to depredations, and that the implied comparison was slightly 'odorous;' nor, to speak more seriously, does he seem to have considered that the Beauchamp Almshouses did not exist for the purpose of supplying Mr. Skinner with an English home for three seasons of the year. The trustees of the institution were bound to consider its interests before those of its warden as an individual. Already they had had much experience of his incapacitating ill-health. He had a very 'bad attack' soon after his appointment (p. 206); after his brother's death in 1867 he had to go to Torquay (p. 252); in the next year his daughter's death broke him down again for a time, and he had to exchange houses with the Rev. E. Cleaver, who came to take 'his Lent work' (p. 274). He was again unwell, and quite unfit to work, in the January of 1872 (p. 297). 'The final breakdown, from which he never entirely rallied' (p. 300), came in the following August, when he was taking a holiday in Wales. 'Early in 1873' his medical advisers sent him out of England, and he did not return to Newland until November (p. 319). In the next January he was entirely laid up, for many weeks, by bronchitis, the result of a cold caught while examining the house to be occupied as a 'Clergy House of Rest,' the predecessor of the present institution on the western side of the Worcestershire Beacon. In February 1875 he went to Cannes, and returned to Newland in June. But the autumn threw him back, and Dr. Andrew Clark advised him to winter abroad, and it is in regard to this period of wandering in Italy that the authoress lets drop, as if by accident, an intimation of her own companionship,— 'At Spezia almost all *our* days were spent in a boat in the gulf' (p. 326). This was the case before the trustees: is it cynicism on our part to surmise that a male biographer would have been more likely to do them justice?

to co
of th
'his
the '
its k
vario
was
S. A
Cele
tine'
tell
and
S. A
inter
worl
of a
settl
Octo
Asco
the
auth
time
hind
inter
we h
by s
E. B
'The
From
the c
to q
"
up fo
me s
which
them
My c
hours
nothi
V
publ
samy
to th

The rest of the story is soon told. Dr. Pusey invited him to come to Ascot, as chaplain to the Convalescent Hospital of the Devonport Sisterhood. With characteristic hopefulness, 'his venerable friend' counted on the restorative powers of the 'wonderful air' of Ascot. It could not restore Mr. Skinner : its keenness rendered wintering there impossible. He made various expeditions to the Continent ; at the end of 1879 he was at Bath, 'translating,' we are told, 'the *Manuale* of S. Augustine into English odes, published under the title of *Celestia*.' (This '*Manuale*,' we may observe, is *not* S. Augustine's, but a compilation including, as the Benedictine editors tell us, 'dicta plura' of his, but also extracts from S. Anselm and S. Bernard.) Let us say in passing that his estimate of S. Augustine, in some notes to a friend (pp. 370-374), is interesting, especially in regard to that great Bishop's judicial work which is described as the type of the episcopal 'court of audience.' He returned to Ascot in May, and again settled himself at Bath for the winter ; and in the following October, very much to Dr. Pusey's regret, he gave up his Ascot chaplaincy. The charm of his sojourn there had been the close intercourse with Dr. Pusey himself. And here the authoress gives us a sort of foretaste of what we may in due time expect from Dr. Liddon. For as Dr. Pusey's deafness hindered him a good deal from conversing with his friend, their intercourse was chiefly carried on by 'almost daily notes.' Thus we have charming little epistles, bearing the well known, and by so many the dearly loved, signature, 'Yours affectionately, E. B. P.' One of these notes has a characteristic dictum, 'There is no use in complaining, except to God' (p. 362). From another letter, written at Christ Church, and relating to the death of Philip Pusey in January 1880, we cannot forbear to quote a few words :—

'The exhaustion of that night was so great that . . . I was laid up for some weeks, and although I thanked God for having preserved me such a son for nearly fifty years, I could not read the letters which were written in such kindness to me. When I could read them, I still could not write of them. God was indeed very good. My dear son was cut off from all human aid. He was for those six hours insensible to the outer world. He could hear absolutely nothing, nor feel anything . . .' (p. 357).

What follows is almost too sacred and personal for publication. The letter of farewell to Mr. Skinner is a sample of the deep lovingness of that great heart (p. 74).

'I am worse than a wreck,' Mr. Skinner wrote (evidently to the authoress) in the autumn of 1881. It was with 'a

dying effort' that he wrote 'a "Letter" to the parishioners of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, on the resignation of his old and dear friend' Mr. Liddell (p. 378). As Christmas drew near, the sleeplessness, cough, and asthma became still more trying; but what a characteristic flash of spirit follows! The 'holy night' comes, and finds him 'wakeful and suffering' as ever. He asks his wife to say the *Adeste Fideles*! The glorious words could never have been the vehicle of a more intense faith, a more loving and thankful adoration. Amid that scene of increasing bodily distress and exhaustion on the one side, of bitter anxiety and anticipation of bereavement on the other, one seems to hear them ring out, as if in exultant welcome to Him who 'knew the sorrows' of mankind, and 'came down,' incarnate, 'to deliver them':—

'Yea, Lord, we greet Thee,
Born this happy morning;
Jesu, to Thee be glory given!'

Another time he asked to hear twice over that 77th Psalm which comes more home than any other to sufferers from sleeplessness. And so the days passed by. He had arranged to have his Christmas Communion on December 30; on the 29th, after speaking to his wife of God's '*liberality* and tenderness,' and replying to her loving gaze by the significant words, 'We must not upset each other,' he dictated to her a note, which he signed, and then 'closed his eyes' and fell into a quiet slumber. Mrs. Skinner began to hope that 'he would wake up refreshed; she carried a book to the window, as the light was waning,' then 'heard suddenly a slight gentle sound, and was in an instant at his side,' but 'did not know, until her faithful servant told her, that the last bonds which held the spirit captive had been gently broken'; and five days later she wrote, 'His face has lost all the look of weary pain.' The body was carried to their old home in Worcestershire; and 'far up on the Malvern hills the lights in Newland Church could be seen burning all night' (January 4), 'where watchers knelt in constant prayer' beside the coffin. He was buried the next day, after a choral celebration; and the 'white flowers on the altar' may have reminded some present of his contention, some thirty years back, for the lawfulness of this token of festal joy (p. 385).

Mr. Skinner published very little. A volume of *Warnings and Consolations* represented his teaching at S. Barnabas, and in 1870 he drew up a *Synopsis of Moral Theology*, as an instalment of a plan devised by the Cowley Evangelist Fathers

and by others—that of a Dictionary of Moral Theology. The *Synopsis*—which has been already noticed in these pages—was completed before his death, and published soon afterwards ; but, by a strange and melancholy accident, the whole edition, except about three hundred copies already sold, perished in a great fire on the publishers' premises. Part of the preface is quoted in p. 281, and is of singular interest as expressing Mr. Skinner's condemnation, not only of the grosser corruptions of Roman casuistry, but of the passion for 'systematizing' to which they are historically traceable, and which he pronounces to be distinctly mischievous.

'Of course there are great *principles* of moral and spiritual direction which never change, . . . but these principles coexist with an endless variety of forms in which they are applicable to individuals. . . . Each individual has his own character, and heart, and conscience, and the function of the spiritual guide is not to cramp them into a certain shape, but to direct them according to their own proper and individual necessities. The initiation of healthy direction does not come from the confessor, still less does it come from a type which has been formalized into an ideal. It comes straight from the penitent, enlightened by the gift of God the Holy Ghost, as to his special need,' &c. (p. 283).

The fifteenth chapter consists of a long extract from the introduction to the work, under the title of 'The Claim of Souls upon the Priesthood.' And here, in urging the advantages of private confession as an invaluable help to spiritual self-knowledge, Mr. Skinner does not, to our mind, entirely resist the temptation of an eager arguer to put some force on his documents in the interest of his conclusion. For instance, when contending against the position that private confession should be 'exceptional,' he says (p. 289) :—

'No question is raised about the *fact* that "God hath given power and commandment to His ministers," in the Church of England, "to declare and pronounce to His people," in England, "being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins." Nor is it possible to doubt that before this remission can be "pronounced," the thing to be remitted must also be pronounced ; otherwise the minister might be remitting what ought to be retained, or what the people have never repented of at all.'

Here Mr. Skinner assumes that the daily public confession is not a 'pronouncing,' on the part of the people, of the sins for which they desire forgiveness, because they do not individually mention those sins, but confess them in general language ; and, therefore, that the absolution, so called, which follows, is not a 'pronouncing' of remission. But the rubric,

which was made more emphatic in 1661, expressly describes it as 'the Absolution or Remission of sins, to be pronounced by the priest alone;' and it would be a futility, on the Church's part, to make the priest recite in the preamble a grant of 'power,' unless he was supposed to be exercising it in the assertion thus introduced. On Mr. Skinner's view, we think this formula should be differently worded; the term 'pronounce,' so emphatic in its official significance (as when used in the marriage service, or in a judicial sentence, or in the declaration of an election), should be carefully excluded, instead of being twice put forward; the utterance of the formula should not be restricted to a priest; the rubric should run, 'A declaration of God's readiness to forgive penitents, to be made by the minister'; and there should be no reference to the ministerial commission of the first Easternight.¹ The natural interpretation of the context is that the Church supposes this public absolution to have effect in favour of those whom God knows to have joined sincerely in the preceding confession of sins. We may refer our readers, on this disputed point, to a remarkable article in the *Christian Remembrancer* for April 1849, where it is argued that when the Church of England, in 1548, made private confession no longer obligatory, she thereby restored to general or public absolution that efficacy which had originally belonged to it, but which, on Mr. Skinner's theory, it could never have possessed. The writer adds that 'private confession is a singular mean of personal improvement to those who duly use it,' inasmuch as it tends to make their penitence more real; and he would even 'remind men that the fullest confession' (*i.e.* that made in private) 'is safest for themselves,' besides being the prelude to the most definite and individual assurance of Divine pardon; but he reiterates the opinion that 'Christ speaks equally through all the Church's offices,' and that thus 'the absolution given in our daily service is a true conveyance of remission of sins,' and that the contrary opinion 'would lead to a low estimate of the benefits of public worship.'

Then, again, as to the exhortation before Communion: we cannot follow Mr. Skinner in his view of the person whose 'conscience' must be 'quieted.' He regards him as 'a sinner unable to quiet his own conscience, even when he has quite succeeded in disregarding it, who is or has been in the habit

¹ "Power" implies an authoritative act: and to "pronounce our pardon," if penitent, is a present act—not a mere abstract declaration that God forgiveth the penitent.²—Dr. Pusey's First Sermon on *Entire Absolution*, p. 10.

of com
mean
therefo
be 'ex
passag
person
Eucha
anxiet
to put
argum
these p
for an
attem
scienc
tion d
It run
you a
Churc
crime,
but ou
privat
souls
makes
conver
fitting
restrai
of pri
fession
which
option
for th
was fo
provid
no pul
still an
in 'co
she bo
the re
necess
Mr. S
makin
law of
presen
unders
It

of committing deadly sin, without letting go his faith in the means of grace.' This case, he argues, is not 'exceptional,' therefore neither should its treatment by private confession be 'exceptional.' But *is* this the case contemplated by the passage in question? Surely not. The Church speaks of persons who 'doubt' and 'scruple' about approaching the Eucharist; who have secret 'griefs'—that is, *bonâ fide* religious anxieties; who need 'further comfort' in order to enable them to put 'full trust in God's mercy.' For the purpose of this argument Mr. Skinner unconsciously blackens the case of these persons, or, more properly, substitutes one class of persons for another. Further, he assumes that no one ought to attempt to quiet his own conscience for himself; 'the conscience must be . . . disciplined from without.' The exhortation does not warrant us in making so absolute an assertion. It runs to this effect: Examine yourself, and repent; but if you are still disquieted, then use private confession. The Church does not say, 'If any of you be . . . in any grievous crime, go to the priest first, and then to that holy table;' but ought she not to say so if, as Mr. Skinner apparently held, private absolution is *the* Divine way of 'healing' sin-sick souls? It is curious to see the confidence with which he makes this assumption: 'the power of the Holy Ghost in converting souls cannot, without blasphemy, be restrained to fitting "exceptional" occasions,' &c. But surely this is to restrain that Divine Power itself to the particular ordinance of private confession. Mr. Skinner fully admits that confession in the English Church is left optional; but if the view which he seems to have held be correct, ought it to be left optional? Again, he utilizes the Church's expression of regret for the loss of public Lenten discipline; but this discipline was for 'persons convicted of notorious sin,' whereas he is providing chiefly for the victims of sinful habits which cause no public scandal; and when he suggests that, since sin exists still among the children of the English Church as it did while, in 'communion with the whole body of Western Christendom, she both learned and practised the old original common law, the reasonable assumption is that' she, 'compelled by the old necessities, abides by the old laws,' we ask, What old laws? Mr. Skinner could neither mean that the 'law' of A.D. 1216, making yearly private confession obligatory, was an original law of the Church of Christ, nor that it was retained by the present Church of England. We are therefore at a loss to understand what this 'reasonable assumption' comes to.

It is an unwelcome task thus to criticize observations most

obviously dictated by an intense desire to minister to deep spiritual needs. We are well assured that in very many cases private confession made in order to private absolution is the most efficient available remedy for the disease which ravages the interior life; that it often does what nothing else can do in the way of bringing the soul face to face with God, of forcing it to see the facts of its own case, and thus of making repentance thorough; that, as habits of sin too often are hard to cure, this remedy has often to be again and again resorted to, and that to drop the use of it would be a grave neglect of a Divinely provided safeguard, to which the soul's own consciousness had borne testimony; that it is often useful in sustaining a self-watchfulness in view of the possible return of old temptations; that arguments from the abuse of this ordinance are of the same value as arguments from an unpractical attendance on sermons or a perfunctory frequenting of services; that very much of the popular *talk* against confession is the mere outcome of 'anti-sacerdotal' prejudice and of a total want of that knowledge which comes from experience, and that it ought to be met by two plain questions: (1) 'Did you ever try for yourself the practice which you are denouncing?' (2) 'Do you "confess your faults" to anyone? and, if not, with James v. 16 before you (where also the revisers read "sins"), why not?' We may regret—and, frankly, we do regret—that the attenuation in 1552 of the language about confession in the exhortation of 1548 and of 1549 was not more efficiently amended in 1661; but, for all that, we hold that no good can come of straining our text for the convenience of our comment. So long as every English bishop has to say while ordaining a priest, 'Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained,' there will remain for this ordinance a broader area than is supplied by the case contemplated in the exhortation before Communion, or by the express order that the priest who visits a sick person shall 'move him to make a special confession of his sins if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.'

There is another subject on which we think Mr. Skinner rather too much of a 'legalist': we refer to what he calls 'the rule of the Catholic Church, laid down for East and West, that the blessed Sacrament should be received "the first food of the day," therefore fasting, except in the case of "persons at the time of death."'

'There is nothing *said* about this rule in the English Prayer Book, because, evidently, it is just one of those things of fact which never

was and
to be sa
that the
declarat
versal c
the Chu

So
Novem
weak l
tion pu
I beg,
except
sulting

No
antiqu
our ge
and sp
Liddo
to the
reprint
obligat

'E
instinct
the fres
word h
yet pas
momen
the mo
recogni
heart, a
this ex
advant

It
munio
howev
the at
instea
Churc
the 'la
tion';
ancien
had d
Articl

was and never could be gainsaid, and about which, if anything was to be said, it would have been in the form of an intimation in terms, that the rule is *not* binding on the English people. But no such declaration appears. Therefore, according to my judgment, the universal custom of the Church of Christ is binding on the children of the Church of England.'

So wrote the vicar of Newland to the *Guardian* in November of 1875, by way of relieving himself, when in very weak health, from the burden of answering 'the same question put to him by various persons in various circumstances. I beg,' he continues, 'to disclaim the least value for my advice, except for those who have exercised their discretion in consulting me' (p. 306).

Now, for our part, while fully recognizing the venerable antiquity of this devout observance, we should prefer to rest our general advocacy of it rather on those grounds of moral and spiritual benefit which were so admirably stated by Dr. Liddon in an article on 'Evening Communion' contributed to the *Christian Remembrancer* for July 1860, and subsequently reprinted with his name, than on a basis of supposed canonical obligation. Let us quote some of his words:

'Early Communion is the obvious choice of the devotional instinct. . . . They necessitate an act of self-denial, and they secure the freshest energies of the soul for the altar of God. . . . When no word has yet been uttered except to God, when no nourishment has yet passed the lips, when the first self-dedication of the waking moment still echoes through the soul, there is the truest welcome, the most genuine adoration, the most tender and soul-constraining recognition of the King of kings, who sets up His throne in the heart, as in the world, without observation. Only let a soul have felt this experimentally, and a late Communion will appear to be a disadvantage, an evening Communion simply intolerable.'¹

It is because we desire to see the habit of early Communion extend and consolidate itself (without prejudice however to attendance at Sunday matins) that we deprecate the attempt to enforce it as a matter of positive precept instead of recommending it as a service of devout love. The Church of England certainly has not expressly abrogated the 'law which prevailed on this subject before the Reformation'; she has not dealt with it as she dealt with another very ancient Church rule which Mr. Skinner in his own person had disregarded, and which is set aside, in terms, by the Article 'on the Marriage of Priests,'—we mean, of course, the

¹ *Evening Communion.* By H. P. Liddon, p. 25

ante-Nicene rule, that no priest should marry after his ordination. But if she had meant to retain the 'law,' as such, of fasting Communion, it seems rather strange that she said nothing about it on an occasion when it would have been natural to do so,—when she was framing exhortations as to the conditions of a 'meet partaking of the holy mysteries.' The postponement of the ordinary time of celebration from the old hour of 9 A.M. to a later hour after the conclusion of the Sunday morning service of itself constituted a difficulty which would not have been felt by communicants in the ancient Church, any more than it is felt now by those who, among ourselves, have the privilege of access to the Sacred Feast as early as 8 A.M. Granted that the mediæval English Church exhorted her children to hear matins before Mass on Sundays; the habits of social life have transferred the hour of matins from about 7 A.M. to about 11 A.M., and while this change has led to the introduction of celebrations before matins, it should in all equity be taken account of with regard to those who must communicate after matins or not at all. There are also persons who, although not 'invalids,' cannot go out even to an early service without *some* food. Dean Hook has pointed out that the very early hour of Archbishop Parker's consecration was fixed in part, 'because, as the Holy Communion was received fasting, a service so long as the consecration service undertaken by elderly men might have produced exhaustion.'¹ Mr. Skinner proceeds to deal with the representative case of one who, being medically restrained from walking two and a half miles to an early celebration, has access only to a late celebration, 'and if I fast till after' it 'I am unfit for work the next day.' He says:—

'I am disposed to think that if you make it plain to the priest that in refusing to celebrate in the early morning, he *forces* you to receive unfasting against your conscience and the custom of the universal Church, you are committing a less irregular act by receiving and throwing the responsibility upon the priest and the Bishop, than by depriving yourself, or suffering him to deprive you, of the food of your soul. In such a case I would recommend a light refreshment, without meat, or eggs, or butter, six hours before receiving' (p. 307).

Is it not, at least, doubtful whether the correspondent to whom this advice was given would be morally in a position to administer an implied rebuke to the parish priest, and mentally, at least, to involve his Bishop in that censure? Moreover, we are surprised that one like Mr. Skinner should be

¹ Hook, *Lives of Archbishops of Canterbury*, ix. 245.

cont
from
in q
he r
this
noth
part
plain
xii.
rathe
have
differ
stru
in reg
in an
"to h
ticip
allud

'I
other
depar
(p. 30

N
veste
Mr. S
all su
The
for m
Charl
Chev
A
in the
of 18.

'M
monie
and h
ringin
cultiva
and s
and th
natura

S
spirit

content to describe a deliberate abstinence, perhaps for months, from 'the food of the soul,' in order not to break the 'rule' in question, as 'more irregular' than the course which in fact he recommends. One would have expected to hear less in this connection about a 'law' as to which our Church says nothing, and more about the supreme duty and blessing of partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ: more, to speak plainly, on the question What would *He* who uttered Matt. xii. 3-7 desire His weakly servants to do? And this the rather, because no one who ever gave advice to souls could have been more deeply sensible than Mr. Skinner was of the difference between a principle and a rule, or of the merely instrumental and subsidiary character of ceremonial observance in regard to the essentials of personal religion; not to say that, in another letter on the same subject, he treats it as 'a case of "to his own master,"' adding (not without some implied scepticism as to the existence of any such 'necessity' as he alludes to):—

'It must be left with the individual conscience, and to none other, to weigh the character of the "necessity" which compels a departure from the *mos universalis* of the Catholic Church of Christ' (p. 309).

Now here, by denying that there is any dispensing power vested in the Church's officers as to this alleged obligation, Mr. Skinner implicitly denies the obligation to exist. For all such 'canonical laws' are dispensable under due authority. The Pope can dispense with the law of fasting communion for members of the Roman Church, as Julius III. did for Charles V., after his abdication, and Benedict XIV. for the Chevalier de St. George.

As to externals in general, Mr. Skinner had written thus, in the very spirit of Dr. Pusey, during the old 'surplice-war' of 1845:—

'Matters of mere external import, such as surplices and other ceremonies, will always do harm if pressed unduly and in the wrong place; and hence all the senseless and wicked outcry which has been ringing from Exeter to York. Let them come *last*, not *first*. First cultivate Christian graces—gentleness, submission, obedience, faith—and strive to make a flock earnest and serious on right principles; and then all that is Catholic in ritual and external worship will follow naturally' (p. 29).

So he writes to a person fretting under some privation of spiritual privileges:—

'Sacraments are His : He supplies them' (i.e. the want of them) 'through the great sacrament of obedience. You substitute your own will for that, and are over-persuaded by love of self to desire what you would like instead of what He desires for you. So if you analyse it, it is absence of love for Him, and love of self. . . . It is wrong to speak of being cut off : it is a preference of your own will to the will of God' (p. 105).

Again :—

'You are cut off from external aids and means of grace. . . . If it be God's doing that you suffer loss and pain, and cutting off and shutting up, shall He not make His own will and your conformity thereunto more sacramental and prodigal of grace to your soul than if you had the ordering for yourself of daily communions and daily instructions at will? It is a sign of absolute unbelief when we are more in search of God's *means* of grace than of God, and therefore more out of heart, when God shuts us up from sacraments, drawing us closer to Himself through the obedience of suffering, than when we have access daily and hourly to the altar,' &c. (p. 118).

Again, in the same letter, as to rules :—

'Do not vex your memory with rules which were applicable in detail to other circumstances, but which are only good for present emergencies in their principle and in their substance.'

And as to all spiritual helps :—

Trust Him implicitly and wholly; not His promises, or His sacraments, or His priests, or His grace—all these, but not these *only*—but HIM. . . . Trust yourself to Him with the trust of an infant ; of absolute, undoubting, unconditional surrender' (p. 120).

Again, in a later letter :—

'He can save us without sacraments, ay, without the Church at all, if He sees fit to bring us into such sorrow as that by no fault of our own, and without our own faith and union (subjectively) with His Church failing, though sacraments and the Church itself should be visibly lost to our eyes' (p. 313)

Again :—

'Whatever helps us to patience and humility contributes more to our spending Good Friday well, than any flood of "opportunities" and "privileges" in outward things' (p. 338).

Once more, not less pointedly as to *that* for which ordinances exist :—

'There must be an external organization for the carrying out of God's designs ; but when we come to individual souls, it is their relation to Him which really makes the difference as to a soul going further from Him or coming nearer to Him. This is our consolation

in perplexity and difficulties . . . that in spite of all outward trial . . . one thing never can be touched, the inner relation between the children and the Father' (p. 312).

That Mr. Skinner, however, could give very precise and detailed rules of conduct, especially for times of special self-scrutiny and devotion, appears from pp. 123-127, p. 181, and pp. 224-240. The spiritual letters quoted appear to have been addressed to women, and some of them to women suffering from a restless and morbid scrupulosity, and he takes very great pains in patiently dealing with such cases. But much of his advice is of universal applicability, and impressive as clearly indicating a deep knowledge of the human soul. Occasionally one is reminded of Newman's sermons. Mr. Skinner's keen insight into the varieties of self-love is, perhaps, the most signal of his qualifications for the task of a spiritual adviser. In one passage he describes 'impatience with the stupidity of a servant, and impatience under barrenness of spiritual condition, as the two extremes of the same line of evil—inordinate love of self' (p. 136). In another he is curiously precise on this head, after pointing out the connection between sloth and anger:—

'Anger, after all, is but a form of the same root of evil, of which there are other six forms; and when once you catch hold of that root of selfishness, you can see with a little penetration, how they all hang together, and play into each other's hands' (p. 310).

He discourages all eager craving for spiritual comfort very much in the manner of the *Imitation*, ii. 9. Thus:—

'Seek compunction, not consolation. . . . Consolation is not so good for the soul, or so great a gift from God, as compunction,' &c. (pp. 108, 115).

He treats the common trouble of spiritual dryness or dullness as wisely as S. Francis de Sales, who, we are told, used to say that 'dried fruits were better than moist;' that 'one ought to show whether one followed Christ for the sake of bread, or in the spirit of His apostles;' and again that S. Peter 'wished to stay on Mount Tabor, but fled from Mount Calvary.' Our English teacher is not so lively and picturesque, but he is on the same lines when he says, 'It will be to you a gainful Eastertide if you will but offer your "dulness" to God as the result of your own infirmity' (p. 115); or again, 'Your cold feelings are not you, not part of your moral self,' &c. (p. 107). Distractions in prayer, he says, are voluntary or involuntary; if the former, they betoken a want of control over the senses, or of due preparation for prayer; if the latter, they are a

punishment for past negligence in prayer, and 'God may take them away from you and set you free, or He may not. Never mind; go on trusting Him for years, yea, even unto death' (p. 191). He is as emphatic as Dr. Pusey¹ in reminding distressed souls that the mere thought of evil, suggested to mind or memory, but rejected by heart and will, is not sin: and he quotes an apposite consolatory maxim, '*Non nocet sensus ubi deest consensus*' (p. 247).

Perhaps he may be thought to have had rather a Latin than a Teutonic mind. If so, he so far resembles the late Bishop Forbes rather than Dr. Pusey. Occasionally he seems to map out the ground to be covered by a series of devotional exercises with too great minuteness of detail. Once he prescribes 'the Angelus,' probably meaning simply Luke i. 28, as in the *Way of Life* (p. 138). Again, he speaks of 'examen' for self-examination (p. 136). In another place he uses 'luxury,' when he evidently means sensuality, the *luxuria* of Roman Catholic moralists (p. 239). Again he says, '*We* are the descendants of the Catholics who, in the first ten years of Elizabeth, made no difficulty whatever in conforming to the Reformed worship' (p. 245). But he gives some salutary warnings against an exaggeration of the principle of obedience in 'religious communities':—

"Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." This dictum involves the contrast between the spontaneous and loving exercise of the Christian intellect and will and heart, and the servile tyranny of fear and obscurity' (?) "in the work of obedience. . . . S. Bernard's treatise, *De precepto et dispensatione*, has been thought authoritative, and he pronounces against the *mechanical* instruments of an Abbot or a Prior's will, "*Nihil me Prælatus prohibeat horum quæ promisi, nec plus exigat quam promisi*" (p. 342).

And not a few pages of the book are filled with topics of rejoinder to Roman proselytizers, or admonitions to persons prepossessed in favour of Rome. For instance, a correspondent advised him to consult Dr. Pusey, and professed 'disappointment' at the result. Mr. Skinner does not spare the lash in his reply:—

'It is the course which others have taken before you, first to form a will and a purpose for themselves, and then to hurry on with it without justice to others' (p. 129).

Dr. Pusey, it appears, had spoken to this person about 'different Churches.' Mr. Skinner points out that this phrase

¹ Dr. Pusey, *Paroch. Serm.* ii. 334-336.

has a true sense, in that within the one body mystical there are so many parts, as S. Paul speaks of 'the Churches' in transmitting a salutation. 'Plenary inspiration,' he adds, is promised to the whole Church only; Rome has no monopoly of the Spirit's guidance. Dr. Pusey appears not to have meant that the Holy Spirit did not teach the same doctrines to all, but that He

'has taught all, and taught all the same . . . but that while the Holy Spirit has thus brought all in one, man and his evil master have ever been seeking to drive all asunder; that they have too well succeeded; that doctrines not taught by the Holy Spirit, *because not taught to all*, have been taught by some, and so it has been brought to pass, as Dr. Pusey says, that "some have been permitted to fall into error." You seem to me partly not to do Dr. Pusey's statements justice, and partly not to understand them. . . . The division of Christendom is a fact which you must face, account for it as you may. I am not authorized to explain it, any more than you. But I must demur to the complacency with which Roman Catholics arrogate to themselves all the *right*, and attribute to the rest of the Christian world all the wrong.'

Again, a lady in a similar state of feeling is thus plainly dealt with:—

'As to your "faith in the English Church" which you say you "are losing," I should like to hear in what "Church" you are gaining faith! . . . If you saw as much as I have seen of the Roman and French and Spanish *accidents* infecting and affecting the Body of Christ . . . you would admit that our English accidents are not half so mischievous in their *direct* dishonour to God' (p. 133).

We have already quoted a remark of his as to the cause of lay alienation from faith within the Roman pale. A paper of 'Moral Considerations recommended to persons unsettled by Roman Claims' is given at p. 241. We do not feel sure that it would not, here and there, provoke a rejoinder. Thus, the Roman objection from divisions existing among English Churchmen is parried by the remark that 'Epiphanius mentions no less than eighty distinct heresies prevalent in the Church between the day of Pentecost and the end of the fourth century.' Now, not to say that Epiphanius did not write quite at the end of that century, one must observe that he includes in his list various forms of purely Gentile and Jewish thought, together with the Gnostic sects; and that of the Christian 'heresies' nearly all had been branded as such by the Church authority of their time. Again, Mr. Skinner here appears to argue that where the 'universal creeds' are received, there must be catholicity of doctrine. He might have been asked whether heresy could not exist in regard to

a point not expressly stated in those creeds. He also ventures to say that since 'there is more successful combination among men for evil than there is for good, unity in visible strength will never pass muster as a good argument for the Catholic Church, whatever Rome may claim for the Roman ;' but that, were it otherwise, we have more of *actual* unity than Rome has, 'because we recognize the truth common to all in the world, of East and West, in the churches of Asia and Africa, &c., as well as' in 'Italy and Gaul and Spain,' whereas Rome simply anathematizes those whom she has not subjected ; and because

'there are no such vital differences touching the soul of Christianity among our too candid and outspoken English countrymen as are now to be found eating away the spiritual life of Italians and Frenchmen and Spaniards, with all the more voracity because well-concealed beneath the veil of outward conformity. And there is more *potential* unity among us than in Rome, because . . . the doctrine of the papal supremacy, developed recently into a dogma of the faith necessary to salvation, and culminating in the Pope's personal infallibility, is the seed of division in her bowels' (p. 244).

The argument from the state of the Roman Church's laity in many parts of her empire has a very serious force of its own, but we fear that something could be said on the other side as to the sentiments of many in England who attend our churches with exterior decorum. And as for our readiness to fraternize, that is not quite the point ; the question asked is, What Church will fraternize with *you* ? Mr. Skinner should also have avoided inaccuracy in the last quoted sentence. It cannot be charged against the Vatican Council that it erected Papal supremacy into a dogma. That was done long before. What the Council did was to adopt an extreme form of that dogma, relating to the Papal jurisdiction and to the Papal *magisterium*.

We wish we had space for a long extract from Mr. Skinner's record of his visit to Dr. Döllinger on June 17, 1879 (p. 348). We must needs give two or three short specimens. Dr. Döllinger told him, that 'Fr. St. John had had great difficulty, though sent to Rome for the purpose, to keep the *Apologia* off the Index.' Again, he said :—

'When Manning had just been received into the Roman Communion, he called on me to express his grateful thanks for being the cause of this event, in that I had first taught him to believe that truth was possible to a Roman Catholic theologian. . . . Since he had read my historical manual, he had learned for the first time that' (among Roman Catholics) 'historical truth was paramount,' &c.

We part from this interesting memoir with regret, and with earnest thanks to the authoress for having not only thus a second time enriched our Church biography, but added to our stores of practical theology; although in the volume we may see some traces of indiscriminating partisanship. We have said nothing about the pathetic chapter describing the decline and death of Mr. Skinner's daughter. Possibly the objection which some have felt to the publication of Mrs. Tait's narrative of her own bereavements at Carlisle might, in a modified form, apply to passages of this record. A letter of Agnes Skinner's, describing what was in fact her last Easter festival, is a little too full of religious 'excitement' to be appropriate for publication. We can well believe that to her own and her parents' friends she unconsciously exhibited a 'beauty of mind and character' which was 'almost startling,' and might seem a thing too radiant to tarry long.

The writer who thus described her, and whose letter is quoted at p. 219, says there that Mr. Skinner's 'power came from the strength of love which he possessed'—a love which rested supremely on 'that Divine Master to whom his whole being was consecrated.' When, in the last hours of his life, he spoke with feeble accents of Christ's love for him, 'his face shone with an expression of rapture' (p. 383).

There are a few misprints in the book—*e.g.*, 'St. Thomas of Aquinas' (p. 356); 'Acta Martyrorum' (p. 352); and (what is at first sight rather startling) 'the fourteenth book of the *Imitatio*' (p. 136). We must venture on one further criticism, however trivial the point in question may seem. The authoress, in this volume, although not in the former, makes it a rule to give the verb 'to celebrate' an initial capital, as, 'He . . . took up again his usual work, Celebrating every morning' (p. 276); 'He was able to Celebrate,' &c. (p. 326). This peculiarity occurs thrice in two pages (pp. 334, 335). Now, English verbs are not so written; and a Dissenting biographer would never think of writing, 'Mr. So-and-so Preached with much acceptance.' And, speaking more generally, we submit that as emphasis is not really secured by the abundance of italics which we find, for instance, in theological books of the last century, so neither is reverence really enhanced by the profusion of initial capitals which has become a 'fad' with some writers of the 'advanced Catholic' school. Mrs. Sidney Lear, for instance, goes so far as to write 'for God's Sake,' as if 'sake' represented some Divine attribute. Those who write in behalf of religion would do well to eschew eccentric mannerisms, and, in particular, to bear in mind that a

casual reader is more likely to be irritated than impressed by what will seem to him an obtrusive and factitious symbol of the idea of religious awe.

ART. IV.—THE THREE ANGLICAN BISHOPS IN JERUSALEM.

1. *Joseph Barclay, D.D., LL.D., Third Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem: a Missionary Biography.* (London, 1883.)
2. *Unfairness, Vituperation, Slander, and Inaccuracy Exposed.* Being a Reply to an Anonymous Review of the Biography of Bishop Barclay, published in the *Record* of June 22, 1883, and to a Letter signed 'H. B. Tristram' in the same Paper on June 8, 1883. Printed for Private Circulation.
3. *The Episcopal See of S. James in Jerusalem.* Article by GÜDER in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*. English-American Edition. (Edinburgh, 1883.)
4. *Das Evangelische Bisthum in Jerusalem.* Geschichtliche Darlegung mit Urkunden. (Berlin, 1842.)
5. *Statement of Proceedings relating to the Establishment of a Bishopric of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem.* Published by Authority. (London, 1841.)
6. *Memoirs of James Robert Hope-Scott of Abbotsford, D.C.L., Q.C.* By ROBERT ORNSBY, M.A., Professor in the Catholic University of Ireland. (London, 1884.)

THE title under which we write expresses, it is evident, rather a surmise than a demonstrated fact. It is not for us to prophesy that there will be no fourth bishop sent forth to Jerusalem by the Anglican Church. But the experience of the forty-two years since the see was first founded has, if it has little other result to show, at least done something to clear the position. The experience gained during these years has gone far to prove that such a bishop is forced to occupy an utterly anomalous position in a foreign country, and in the midst of the ancient Patriarchate held by another prelate; and that the difficulties of the position are great, if not insuperable, as was tolerably sure to be the case in the working of an experiment, by the makers of which Catholic precedents were too much disregarded. And it certainly seems as if the third

Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem would also be the last. Bishop Barclay died in October 1881, and no successor, during the nearly three years which have since elapsed, has been nominated. It is, in fact, understood that the Emperor of Germany, to whom, under the provisions of the Act of 1841, the nomination would fall, does not propose to name a successor, and for the present, at all events, the strange compact is to lie dormant. Political exigencies may indeed revive a project which was devised in the first place partly, if not wholly, for a political end; but, so far as can be perceived at present, the aspiration of Dr. Newman, made while he was yet an Anglican, has been literally realized, 'May that measure utterly fail and come to naught, and be as though it had never been!'

The remarkable thing about this result will be that the See should die out (if it be so) unregretted on all sides. It has been entirely barren of results, good or bad. It had become abundantly evident that the money was being wasted. It may be allowed that it has never had a fair chance, seeing that, of the three occupants of the see, not one, by a strange infelicity, has been in every respect a suitable man to administer it, or has had tenure of the see a sufficient time to make his mark upon it. What a really representative Anglican bishop in Jerusalem might have been and have done for the Churches around, benumbed so long by ignorance and palsied by oppression, has not, it may be said with the simplest truth, been tried at all. He should have been at once a man thoroughly familiar with the vernacular languages of Palestine; a scholar whose mind was steeped in all Western culture and Biblical learning; a prelate, really a Churchman in sympathies, and who realized the vast capabilities of his office and function in the Church when rightly exercised; and a missionary of abounding enthusiasm, sufficient bodily strength, unwearied activity, and, to crown all, a man of power and force of character; and what influence such a bishop might have wielded for good it is, no doubt, hard to say. It is quite possible that, under such conditions, those bright anticipations which were expressed, when the See was founded, of the consequences it would have, might in such a case have been realized. *Diis aliter placuit.* So far the scheme has practically failed; and having failed it was well that it should come to an end as speedily as possible. We propose, in our present number, taking occasion from the recent publication of a 'Biography of Bishop Barclay,' to recall briefly the circumstances which led to the establishment of the See, and to notice the chief events in the career of this its latest occupant.

It would seem, as we have said, that the Jerusalem bishopric was foredoomed to fail from the outset, because it was one of those too numerous instances in which the Church, her organization, and her spiritual powers, have been used by the Kings of the earth as pawns in the game of their earthly statesmanship, of that 'Kingcraft,' *Regierungskunst*, of which the Prussian State, as Electorate, Kingdom, and Empire, has afforded (shall we say affords?) more than one illustrious example. In 1840 the Crown Prince of Prussia succeeded his father as Frederick William IV. It was a year of stirring events in the East. The great Pasha of Egypt, Mehemet Ali, had for seven years been in possession of Syria, and had given to that down-trodden land a glimpse of comparatively firm and good government, and of consequent prosperity. But his suzerain the Sultan, jealous of so formidable a vassal, strove by force of arms to resume the coveted province, and failing, sought and obtained the assistance of England and the other European Powers. During the summer of 1840 the combined fleets of the Powers were threatening the coast of Syria. Beyrout and Acre were captured, Alexandria blockaded, and Mehemet Ali obliged to resign Syria to the Sultan, when it immediately fell back into the chronic misery which afflicts every province under the sway of the Turkish Government. Prussia was a party to the treaty of July 1840 for the resettlement of Syria, and the new King, desirous of still exercising influence in the East, and urged on by his favourite minister, Bunsen, took up the idea of constituting himself the protector of the Protestant communities in Palestine and the East, as the clergy and pilgrims belonging to the Greek Church were supported by Russia, and those of the Latin Church by France. Nor was it merely by the desire to make a new diplomatic departure that he was moved. Religious motives attracted him to the Holy Land as well as political ones; nor could he see without affliction the Christian religion trodden down in the Holy Land under the barbaric power of the Mohammedan Turk. In brief, he was a Crusader seven centuries too late. His first step was to dictate (in French) a *Mémoire* on the condition of the 'Holy Places' at Jerusalem, which was presented to the four Great Powers on March 30; a somewhat enthusiastic production, from which no consequence followed beyond the ill-natured witticism, '*Ce serait établir une Cracovie religieuse.*'¹

Failing then, as might have been expected, to obtain the

¹ Bunsen's *Memoir*, vol. i.

giving
form
allen

'a n
nopl
the
of th
Bish
comm

testa
Pale
and
they
rem
the
the
Tur
prac
adhe
spec
baffl
of B
Brit
Lon
mot
and
quit
view
atta
Eng

in E
—w
advi

and,

1
2

pres
'It is
excel
he w
again
the a

giving over of the Holy Places into Christian hands without formally withdrawing them from the Turkish empire, his *pis aller* was

'a negotiation jointly with the English Government at Constantinople to obtain the acknowledgment of a Protestant body, as such, in the Turkish empire; and a confidential negotiation with the heads of the Church of England, desiring of them the establishment of a Bishopric in Jerusalem, with which other Protestant Christians might connect themselves.'¹

Unfortunately for his purpose there were but few Protestants and fewer German subjects within the bounds of Palestine. Germans were not then so addicted to emigration and residence abroad as, under the pressure of the conscription, they have since become; and Frederick William was politely reminded of this want of *locus standi* for his interposition by the Porte in reply to direct representations which he made on the subject. 'There were no German communities,' said the Turk, 'in the Holy Land, and Protestantism had therefore practically no existence in that country. A Church without adherents or representatives could not stand in need of the special privileges for which application was made.' Thus baffled, Frederick William, no doubt still under the influence of Bunsen,² turned his thoughts to England. There were many British subjects travelling through and resident in Syria. A London Missionary Society, known as the 'Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews,' had already a mission and a half-finished church upon Mount Sion. It would be quite in accordance with the eclecticism and liberality of view, which both Bunsen and his master greatly affected, to attain their object, if not alone, yet in combination with the English Church and the English nation.

It was the connexion between the Church and the State in England—the Established condition of the English Church—which rendered it, in the view of Frederick William and his advisers, peculiarly suitable for the enterprise proposed.

'We must acknowledge,' wrote Bunsen, 'that Establishment, and, therefore, the Episcopal authority; the English, on the other

¹ Bunsen to Frederick Perthes, 1841.

² It would seem to have been the idea of Bunsen jointly with the present Lord Shaftesbury. The former writes to his wife in these words: 'It is to me an indescribable delight to be enabled to-day to read to that excellent Lord Ashley the "Instruction" and my further statements; for he was the man who took up our cause, and who set the Jerusalem plan agoing. We made our plan for both in the night of December 10, 1838, the anniversary of the Allocution of 1837.'—*Life*, vol. i. p. 608.

hand, must acknowledge our Augsburg Confession (the parent of all others) and our German order of worship.'

Thus the scheme for the foundation of a Bishopric at Jerusalem had its birth. Bunsen, its first originator, was despatched to England in June 1841 on a special mission to ascertain whether the government and Church of England would assent to a joint mission or to associated action in the Holy Land. The envoy was further instructed to suggest the establishment of an English Bishop at Jerusalem, as in the king's view the most convenient means of attaining the end he desired, and to express his willingness to contribute one-half of the sum required for the endowment; and the necessary Act of Parliament passed with remarkable celerity. The time of Bunsen's arrival in London was the very last hour, so to speak, of the existence of Lord Melbourne's Government; but both he and Lord Palmerston, the Foreign Secretary, were favourable to the scheme, and a Bill was hurried through Parliament with unprecedented speed to establish the See. The *mot* of the day among the *diplomats* was that Bunsen's commission was 'to form a second League of Schmalkald.' Mr. Gladstone hesitated, and at length definitively drew back, in spite of the fascination which Bunsen exercised by his wonderful genius, extensive learning, and exquisite culture, upon all around him, when requested to become a trustee of the fund.¹ Bunsen wrote of him: 'He is beset with scruples; his heart is with us, but his mind is entangled in a narrow system. He awaits salvation from another side, and by wholly different ways from myself.' There were even ominous threatenings from Oxford of secession to Rome if any official sanction were given to the Confession of Augsburg. Notwithstanding this hesitation, all went well and quickly with Bunsen's mission.

The scheme was, on the whole, favourably received. In the following January, the King of Prussia himself paid a visit to England, to be a sponsor at the baptism of the Prince of Wales; and, amongst other things, received a deputation from the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews (among the members of which, it is interest-

¹ Mr. Gladstone finally declined to become a trustee of the English moiety of the Endowment Fund. The trustees (in 1882) of the sum of 20,078*l.* 9*s.* 5*d.* Consols were: The Right Hon. the Earl of Shaftesbury (the only survivor of the original trustees), the Right Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen, the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Ripon, the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Rochester, the Rev. A. I. McCaul, rector of S. Magnus the Martyr, London.

ing to note, was Samuel Wilberforce, then Archdeacon of Surrey) to present him with an address in which the following paragraph occurs:—

‘It is our especial duty and delight to hail in your Majesty a distinguished and chosen friend of the great cause in which we have been so long and so anxiously engaged. It has pleased the Almighty to turn your Majesty’s heart to thoughts of protection and peace towards His ancient people, to raise you up, like Cyrus, for the accomplishment of prophecy, and to set the example among the kings of the earth of that sublime and Christian spirit which rejoices to use all that God has given of wealth and station and power for the defence and consolation of the oppressed and destitute.’¹

À propos of Mr. Wilberforce, as he was then—the first volume of his *Life* shows that he was—like others, a good deal influenced by Bunsen’s charm of manner; and his sanguine mind saw great consequences to follow from this venture in the East. Bunsen, with great tact, put religious motives forward in talking with the young and ardent ecclesiastic, and let the political motives recede into the background; and Mr. Wilberforce was completely won over to the scheme. He writes at this time to an intimate friend:—

‘I have of late got very intimate with Bunsen; when I was last in London I saw him almost every day; we dined together at the Athenæum. I went home with him and spent hours. Once I went with him to Lambeth. He showed me numbers of the King’s private letters, and detailed to me his conversations. The King’s intention is most pure. He quite wishes to gain over his people to true Episcopacy; he longs to give up the keys of the Church, but says, “No, thank you,” to the Lutherans, who wish to take them from him, “because,” he says, “God gave them me, no doubt, to keep till I could give them up to his Bishops, and then I will.” The King seems to me to have acted in the best way. He is a noble creature. . . . If the time would serve, I could tell you most interesting traits as to this Jewish Bishopric and his right-minded simplicity of purpose; but they must be kept till we meet. . . . The King of Prussia’s hope is, by degrees, to get over this very difficulty [this follows a reference to the alleged elevation of S. Ambrose to the Episcopate *per saltum*] by getting his future bishops ordained in Palestine, in order to co-operate with us. Of course, a stubborn old full-grown Lutheran would kick.’²

Besides the possibility of making conversions to the Church from among the Jews, there was a certain charm appealing strongly to the imagination of many earnest Churchmen in this proposal for combined action beyond the

¹ Bishop Wilberforce’s *Life*, vol. i. p. 195.

² *Ibid.* p. 201.

limits of the British Isles. Mr. Gladstone himself wrote to Bunsen: 'I know from the questions I receive on this subject, that the novelty and (as yet) dimness of the scheme has made it act powerfully on the nerves of my countrymen.' The *isolation* of the Church of England was one of the difficulties which pressed heavily in that day upon the minds of her defenders, and was objected to her by Romanist controversialists. It was before the days of the great colonial and missionary movement, which has disclosed an expansive power in the Church of England previously unsuspected, and which has extended the Anglican Communion over every quarter of the globe. Thus the proposal had its attractive side. Well-known names appeared among its supporters. Wilberforce was already won over. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Howley), and the Bishop of London (Blomfield), to whom Bunsen likewise applied, were favourable. Mr. Gladstone, as we have seen, had thoughts of becoming one of the trustees of the fund raised to provide the English moiety of the endowment; though eventually he decided otherwise. Dr. Hook, who was already looked upon as a leader among the more moderate section of Anglicans, not only forwarded a contribution to the fund, but defended the scheme in a published letter to a friend who was doubtful about it. The *Times*, strange to say, objected to the plan, on the ground that it interfered with the prerogatives and duties of 'the Prelate who occupies, by legitimate succession, the episcopal throne of S. James':—a wonderful position, indeed, for the *Times* (as we know it) to occupy! But in reply to this, it was pointed out by Mr. William Palmer, of Worcester College, that the appointment of a Bishop for Palestine 'was not intended as an interference with the prior claims and jurisdiction of the Orthodox Oriental Churches.' The new Bishop was 'to be introduced to the Oriental Patriarchs as the representative of the Anglo-Catholic Churches, and commissioned to prevent, as far as possible, any infringement of their authority and any attempt to proselytize their people.' Thus it was thought that the movement would tend 'to promote, instead of hindering, the union of the Churches;' and looking back upon the history of the See, one can only regret that this ground, at once intelligible and defensible, had not been consistently occupied throughout. Had the successive Bishops of Jerusalem acted in this spirit, most certainly the history of the See would have been far other than has actually been the case. As it is, we are led to believe that not only have they made comparatively few

con
do
Isl
eve
suc
rou
pos
Ori
sion
gan
see

Ch
the
Lu
'T
ing
stit
any
be
a
prin
side

hard
as y
ing

trav
faith
to b
diffi
hand
been
of cl
men
the
Chri
obje
"Of
that
faith
of R
that
mist

obta
tion
coul
abho

converts from Judaism (converts from Mohammedanism do not seem to have been even expected, as apostasy from Islam was punishable by Turkish law with death, at all events up to the time of the war in the Crimea), but that such *entourage* as the mission did succeed in gathering round itself has at all times been largely, if not wholly, composed of native Christians filched from one or other of the Oriental Churches. Probably the traditions of the Missionary Society which supports a distinctly Protestant *propaganda* have been the principal cause of this; for the Bishops seem always to have been more or less ciphers.

On the other hand, the more consistent section of High Churchmen, headed by Dr. Newman, were wholly hostile to the Church of England entering into any alliance with Lutherans, or undertaking any common action with them. 'To admit these to communion with herself without exacting any formal renunciation of error from them, to constitute herself the protector of Monophysites, Nestorians, or any other heretical sects in the East,' appeared to them to be an unwarrantable affront to the Greek and Latin Churches, a most deplorable apostasy from the purity of her own principles, and a serious diminution of her claim to be considered a true branch of the Church Catholic.¹ Mr. J. R.

¹ *Life of Dr. Hook*, vol. ii. p. 97. As an illustration of the somewhat hard and unsympathetic way in which newly realized truths were held as yet by the little coteries at Oxford, the reader may take the following incident which appears in a letter of Bunsen's:—

'The other day, Spörlein, the good pastor of Antwerp, my fellow traveller, arrived, on his pilgrimage to seek comfort in the Church and faith of this country. At Oxford he went to Newman, who invited him to breakfast for a conference on religious opinion. Spörlein stated his difficulties, as resulting from the consistorial government being in the hands of unbelievers, while, in the evangelical society which he had been tempted to join, the leading members protested against every idea of church membership. The breakfast party consisted of fifteen young men, whom Newman invited to an expression of opinion and advice; and the award (uncontradicted) was, that "Pastor Spörlein, as a Continental Christian, was subject to the authority of the Bishop of Antwerp." He objected, that by the Bishop he would be excommunicated as an heretic. "Of course; but you will conform to this decision?" "How can I do that," exclaimed Spörlein, "without abjuring my faith?" "But your faith is heresy." "How! do you mean that I am to embrace the errors of Rome, and abjure the faith of the Gospel?" "There is no faith but that of the Church." "But my faith is in Christ crucified." "You are mistaken; you are not saved by Christ, but in the Church."'

'Spörlein was thunderstruck; he looked around, asked again, obtained but the same reply; whereupon he burst out with the declaration that "he believed in Christ crucified, by whose merits alone he could be saved, and that he would not join the Church of Rome, abhorring her for intruding into the place of Christ." One after the

Hope, Chancellor of the Diocese of Salisbury, followed, in 1841, from the same side, with a pamphlet, in which he argued that the proposed alliance between the Church and Lutheranism could not be carried out, because an Anglican Bishop could only exercise the episcopal office on exclusively Anglican principles, which allowed of no reservations in favour of German Lutherans or other religious bodies.¹

And we are far from saying that there was not a good deal of force in the argument. In fact, we may take it that here the weak point in the scheme was hit by the assailant; and so damaging did the objection seem, that Dr. Hook, in his pamphlet, could only parry it by urging that the German Lutheran element would be merged in the Anglican by the Lutheran members of the Mission conforming to the Church, since it was out of the question that the latter could dispense with her own essential rules and customs: an expectation which, as the history of the See has proved, has been far from being realized. The mere occupation, or apparent occupation, by a Prelate of one communion of the *καθέδρα* of another, may, in the present day, admit of full justification, if it be shown that their spheres of activity are not the same. The episcopal charge is one of souls, not of towns or districts merely; which principle, indeed, was expressly recognized in the Royal Warrant, issued for the consecration of Bishop Alexander, naming 'Syria, Chaldea, Egypt, and Abyssinia, *that is, in so far as souls should there be found desirous of belonging to his diocese.*' That in some of the churches under his jurisdiction the services should be solemnized in non-liturgical forms, or in the German language, may pass as a mere detail. The provision for the ordination of German pastors upon their subscribing the Confession of Augsburg, has, as we have seen, remained for the most part a dead letter; but supposing it otherwise, it must be remembered that the Confession of Augsburg, though inexact (according to Catholic standards) in some respects, and defective in others (particularly in the significant omission, for an

other' dropped away, and Newman, remaining with him alone, attempted an explanation, which, however, did not alter the case.'

¹ *Life of Bishop Barclay*, p. 452. How inherently impracticable the scheme was in details is well shown in the regulations made with regard to ordinations. The Bishop was empowered to ordain Lutherans to minister to German congregations in Jerusalem and elsewhere, upon their subscribing the Confession of Augsburg. This was carried out in two cases; but when those ordained returned to Germany *their ordination was not acknowledged by the Lutheran Church in Prussia, and pastorates could not be found for them!*

obv
can
tha
ext
Ar
wit
wit
wri
jud
her
of
to
and
unc
the
An
Ang
aut
Apo
stan
nec
law
as
and
allia
pos
ture
cent
Chu
Bish
had
in th
earn

far f
Alex
prela
Lon
crate
of th
taking
by th
Nor

Dr. M

obvious reason, of all reference to the Apostolic Succession), cannot fairly be called an heterodox document, any more than our own Thirty-nine Articles, which are to so large an extent founded upon it. The authors of it protest in their Art. XXII. that there is nothing in it 'which is discrepant with the Scriptures, or with the Church Catholic, or even with the Roman Church, so far as that Church is known from writings [writings of the Fathers],' and that therefore 'they judge us harshly who insist that we shall be regarded as heretics.' Perhaps, too, it may be held that the ordinations of a single Bishop, and the terms on which he admits men to Holy Orders, are matters which compromise only himself, and ought not to be taken as of general concern. But, unquestionably, the anomalous ecclesiastical condition of the Lutheran Churches must impose a distinct reserve upon Anglican relations with them. If there be any Catholic and Anglican principle more distinct than another, it is that the authoritative ministerial commission, the preservation of the Apostolic Succession of office and function, is the *articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ*. But that the want of this must necessarily render any degree of co-operation whatever unlawful may be, perhaps, questionable. It is not, for instance, as if the Prussian Churches were furious anti-Episcopalians; and it should not be forgotten that a precedent exists for an alliance even closer between the two Churches than that proposed in this instance. A former King of Prussia made overtures through Dr. Jablonski, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, for an alliance and real union between the English Church and those of his own dominions; and most probably Bishops would have been consecrated for Prussia at that time, had it not been for the lukewarmness of Archbishop Tenison in the matter; his brother Primate of York (Sharp) was very earnest for it.

This digression on points of principle has, however, led us far from the orderly course of events. The first Bishop, Dr. Alexander, was consecrated at S. Paul's in 1841; the officiating prelates being Howley of Canterbury, Blomfield of London, Lonsdale of Lichfield, and Selwyn, the then newly-consecrated Bishop of New Zealand. It is recorded in the 'Life' of the last-named prelate that he had some hesitation as to taking part in the rite, but was, naturally enough, overborne by the influence of his elder in the Episcopate, the Primate. Nor did the sermon preached at the service by Dr. M'Caul,¹

¹ The Bishopric had been offered, it is said, in the first instance, to Dr. M'Caul himself.

the then leading mind at the Jews' Society, tend to mend matters in the Bishop's mind ; for he spoke of the 'idoltrous' Greek Church, dilated on 'the re-establishment of a Bishop in the line of the Circumcision,' a theory which, if it were anything more than a mere flourish, the Bishop rightly thought 'unsound and unscriptural'; and, to crown all, the preacher was asked by the Archbishop to print his sermon!

Bishop Alexander, by birth a Prussian Jew, after his conversion became a clergyman of the Irish Church, but at the time of his selection for the Bishopric had been for almost twenty years Professor of Hebrew at King's College, London. He was sent out with great *clat* in a British ship of war, and the British Consul-General was directed to accompany him from Beyrout to Jerusalem, in order to instal him with all the 'pomp and circumstance' of diplomacy in his post. This was done. The Bishop and his party embarked on board the 'Devastation,' and in January 1842 they reached Jerusalem. The mission had indeed some memories of encouragement. Dr. Joseph Woolff had been its bold pioneer in Jerusalem and the Holy Land in 1822 and 1823; while the Rev. Lewis Way, who was greatly interested in missions to the Jews, had formed plans for a Missionary College or Association Mission there. But it was at that time in a state of great depression, consequent upon the recent war between the Turks and Egyptians: there was one missionary only left in Jerusalem, and not more than four throughout the whole of Palestine; two the Bishop took out with him, and with the establishment of a small theological college at Jerusalem, and the resumption of the building of an Anglican church on Mount Sion, the work of the Mission might seem to have fair prospects of success. In the following year the Coptic Patriarch (of Alexandria) wrote to Bishop Alexander, addressing him as 'Metropolitan,' begging his protection for Christians of the Coptic rite who should come to Jerusalem. A hospital was established, which was eagerly resorted to by the Jewish population, though a *cherem* or anathema was pronounced by the Rabbi on those who attended it, and some conversions were made *from among Jews*; there were usually from forty to fifty communicants at the monthly celebration. But such prospects of the carrying out the design of the mission were cut short by the sudden death of Bishop Alexander, in the desert near Cairo, while on a visitation, in November 1845. The only other marked incident of these years was the so-called 'schism of Hasbeyah,' in which a number of Greek Christians at Beyrout broke loose from their own Church, and applied to Bishop Alexander to

be admitted into communion with the Church of England. There was great reason to believe that they did this, not from a purely religious motive, but under the idea that they would thereby become British subjects, and be freed from Turkish oppression; and, from whatever reason, the Bishop declined to comply with any of their requests, and desired them to return to their homes and wait patiently. The result of this action was that, while a few returned to their former obedience, the majority were absorbed by an American mission of Independents or Baptists.

The nomination of the Bishop was, by the terms of the agreement, to fall alternately to the two Powers; and it devolved, therefore, upon the King of Prussia to select the new bishop. His choice fell (much, it is said, to the surprise of the nominee) upon Samuel Gobat, then acting as Vice-Principal of the Malta Protestant College. Dr. Gobat was a Swiss by birth, and an *alumnus* of the Missionary Institution at Basle. On leaving it he proceeded to Paris and to London, for the purpose of further study. Thence he was sent by the Church Missionary Society on a mission in Abyssinia. He travelled through the whole country, although mostly desert, without money or a store of provisions. Among many stories of this period which his narrative contains is the following:—

‘The next day their course lay through a very desolate country, and Mr. Gobat was about to prepare his companions for a fast, but he determined otherwise, because he thought it would betoken his want of faith in God. At noon he had his reward; they were greeted by a young man who presented Mr. Gobat with a basket of provisions and a cruse of beer. “How do you know me?” asked Mr. Gobat. “I know thee not,” replied he; “I am servant to a man who lives some miles off. Last night my master was very restless; at length he rose and gave me orders to carry this gift to the wanderer who would come along this road. As thou art the first white man whom I have met, I present it to thee.” The latter part of their journey lay through a more frequented region, but Mr. Gobat testifies that he was on no occasion reduced to beg for any one thing.’ (Appendix, p. 172.)

During his residence at Malta, he on one occasion undertook a visit to the Druses and Arabs of Mount Lebanon, and the following incident is stated to have occurred during this tour:—

‘On the way to Beyrout a chief of the Druses gave him a pressing invitation to renew the religious discussions which had commenced between them, under his own roof. This Mr. Gobat promised, and a day was accordingly fixed for the purpose, but the unexpected visit

of another Sheik on that day prevented him from keeping the promise. Another day was therefore appointed, but here again the hindrance of a request from the Sheik last mentioned, that he would attend a great assembly of the chiefs of the Druses in his neighbourhood, was interposed. He at this time learned that the vessel, which was to carry him to Alexandria, would take her departure in less than two days. Though he had so few hours to spare, he resolved to keep his promise, and set out from Beyrout; a thick fog, however, caused his guides to lose their way, though they did not discover their error until late in the evening. The party were therefore forced to retrace a portion of their steps, and passed the night in a village about twenty miles from their point of starting. In the morning Mr. Gobat returned to Beyrout, and at noon embarked for Alexandria. Soon after his arrival in that port he received a letter from a friend at Beyrout, stating that a Sheik had come down in search of him, and upon hearing of his baffled attempt to keep his word had remarked, "Surely that man is under the special protection of God; for I confess my only object in pressing him to visit me was to ensnare him to approach the Maronite border, and at the instigation of his enemies to get rid of him on the spot!" (Appendix, p. 174.)

This, then, was the second Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem. He was consecrated at Lambeth in July 1846, and his tenure of office was a long one, lasting until May 1879. The 'Protest' against his consecration, sent by Bishop Phillpotts, of Exeter, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, was followed seven years later by another, probably now much better remembered, of which the late Dr. Neale was the moving spirit. This was occasioned by certain aggressive proceedings of Bishop Gobat upon the native Churches around him, in forgetfulness, or perhaps in ignorance, of the injunction of his ecclesiastical superior contained in the 'Letter Commendatory' addressed to the Prelates of the native Church by the Archbishop of Canterbury on the consecration of Bishop Alexander:—

'We think it right to make known to you that we have charged the said Bishop, our brother, not to intermeddle in any way with the jurisdiction of the Prelates or other Ecclesiastical Dignitaries bearing rule in the Churches of the East, but to show them due reverence and honour.'

Documentary proof exists¹ which renders it unquestion-

¹ If further proof were needed that a policy of proselytizing from the Greek and Syrian Christians was absolutely inconsistent with the intentions of those Churchmen who were the instruments of sending out the first Bishop, it may be supplied in the following quotations from the 'Statement of Proceedings' written (as the German and French versions assert) and (at all events) officially published by the Archbishop of Canterbury himself: 'The immediate objects for which this Bishopric has been founded

able
was
bish
thei
stan
subs
Gob

biog
duri
them
the
little
far a
can
mote
Scho
were
thirt
cont
him
whol
Jews
exac

will a
blishi
Irelan
the en
charg
Churc
canno
interc
as in
sente
taking
not w
ready
friend
Colleg
but 'I
may I
will b
spirit

Sir F
Scott
back
Servi
he ha

able that this breach of Christian comity and Catholic rule was no part of the plan of the original founders of the bishopric; and that Dr. Neale and his co-signatories, though their protest might be faulty in point of form (for what *locus standi* had they in addressing the Eastern Patriarchs?), were substantially in the right in the objection they raised to Bishop Gobat's policy of proselytizing.

'These and other disputes,' observes, however, the biographer of Bishop Barclay, 'were ruinous to the Bishopric during Bishop Gobat's tenure of it. The general effect of them, taken in connection with his advanced age, was that the diocese, so far as the English Church was concerned, was little better than a *tabula rasa*.'¹ Upon none of his work, as far as we can gather, was there the special impress of Anglican Catholicity; as, indeed, how could there be? But he promoted education with considerable success; the Diocesan School and the Orphanage on Mount Sion founded by him were flourishing institutions, and when he died there were thirty-seven schools in various parts of Palestine and Syria, containing about fourteen hundred children, which looked to him as their visitor; with twelve native congregations, the whole supported, in great measure, we imagine, by the London Jews' Society and the Church Missionary Society; though exactly in what proportions it is not easy, nor is it of any

will appear from the following statement . . . It may be the means of establishing relations of amity between the United Church of England and Ireland and the ancient Churches of the East, strengthening them against the encroachments of the See of Rome . . . The Bishop . . . is specially charged not to trench upon the spiritual rights and liberties of those Churches; but to confine himself to the care of those over whom *they* cannot rightly claim any jurisdiction; and to maintain with them a friendly intercourse of good offices. . . . He will establish and maintain, as far as in him lies, relations of Christian charity with other Churches represented at Jerusalem, and in particular with the Orthodox Greek Church; taking special care to convince them that the Church of England does not wish to disturb, or divide, or interfere with them; but that she is ready, in the spirit of Christian love, to render them such offices of friendship as they may be willing to receive.' Then as to the Theological College, it was to be primarily for 'the education of fresh converts,' but 'if the funds of the College should be sufficient, Oriental Christians may be admitted, but clerical members of the Orthodox Greek Church will be received into the College only with the express consent of their spiritual superiors, and for a subsidiary purpose.'

¹ An amusing anecdote, referring probably to this period, is told by Sir Francis H. Doyle in his recent 'Reminiscences of Mr. James Hope Scott' (*Macmillan's Magazine* for March, 1884): 'A friend of mine came back from Jerusalem, and informed me that he had attended Divine Service once, but as the Bishop would persist in saying "Let us pray," he had declined to enrol himself in such a congregation.'

great moment, to ascertain. But there were in 1878, as it seems, about eleven hundred 'adherents,' of whom 229 were communicants, and who were ministered to by eight European missionaries (that is, English clergymen or German pastors, we presume), sixteen European lay agents, three native and Hebrew Christian clergymen, and thirty-seven lay agents of the same race. This does not include four purely German congregations in Jerusalem, Beyrout, Alexandria, and Cairo, which are nominally under the authority of the Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem. But it is to be borne in mind, as showing that the link of connection is slight indeed, that the pastors of these German congregations are not men ordained by the Bishop, but are sent out already ordained from Germany. The proved unworkableness of any closer union we have already referred to.

We come now to Bishop Barclay; and here we are bound to take some notice of the controversy which the recent publication of his biography has occasioned; though it is not our intention to take part in it, or to notice *seriatim* the charges and counter-charges in which the writer and his critics have been indulging. Every reader of the *Biography* will observe that there is no author's name on the title-page; and this is in every way a cause for regret. No work of this kind ought to be published anonymously. It is good for a writer that his pen should be governed and checked by the wholesome sense of responsibility which the publication of his name, at the beginning of his work, necessarily tends to produce. The reading public have a right, in cases in which the original sources of a narrative are not put before them (as must always be the case, more or less, in a posthumous biography) to know *whose* view of the career of the deceased it is that is being put before them, and on what materials it is based; *who* it is that guarantees the correctness of statements made upon matters of fact. This has always been so clear and obvious a matter of propriety that we cannot recollect a single memoir of importance, published during this generation, which has transgressed the rule, until this present *Biography of Bishop Barclay*. Especially should this rule have been observed when a memoir is made the occasion for all manner of charges expressed or insinuated, some of them grave ones, against the men with whom Dr. Barclay was associated, and against the Societies in whose service he was during many years of his life. We can hardly suppose that the 'Journals' or 'Diaries' of Dr. Barclay were filled with such bitter and hostile feeling as we find per-

petu
is gr
much
hum
petu
Carl

sing
able
sent
appe
biogr
indu
ledge
belie

'Wit
frien
in so
appo
work
no k
sourc
destr
sole s
biogr
quent
Barcl
the T
mark
becom
is no
schol
each
ture
clergy
Dr. M

T
prema
curate
of the
the J
period
then s
Churc
labour

petually bubbling up in the pages of his memoir. If not, he is greatly misrepresented; and even if it were so, it is as much a pity to reproduce posthumously these spurts of ill-humour, and to represent Dr. Barclay as living in a perpetual grumble, as it was in the similar instance of Thomas Carlyle.

The life of Joseph Barclay, as it is represented here, was singularly devoid of incident. He was the scion of a respectable landowning family in County Donegal, Ireland, and was sent in due time to Trinity College, Dublin. Here his career appears to have been altogether undistinguished; and his biographer observes, in the acid tone in which he frequently indulges, 'A good rudimentary stock of theological knowledge had now been obtained, which there is no reason to believe was ever after increased to any appreciable extent.' 'With the writings of the Fathers,' continues this very candid friend, 'he never pretended to have any acquaintance, except in so far as they were quoted or referred to in the text-books appointed to be used in the Divinity School'; while 'of the works of the great Mediæval and Anglican divines he had no knowledge, except what reached him from secondhand sources,' and 'with modern theology, whether conservative or destructive, he had very little acquaintance' (p. 11). The sole subject on which he was proficient was, according to his biographer, Rabbinical Hebrew; although when, in a subsequent page, he comes to speak of 'the great work of [Bishop Barclay's] life,' viz. his translation of some of the treatises of the Talmud, he criticizes it with considerable severity, and remarks that it 'has in many places defeated its own purpose by becoming unintelligible' (p. 405). So, in another place, 'there is no reason to believe that he ever became a critical Hebrew scholar' (p. 46). These statements are hardly reconcilable with each other, or with a third declaration that in Rabbinic literature 'he attained so great proficiency as to be among the clergy almost the only living authority since the death of Dr. McCaul, whose opinion was of any value' (p. 11).

To pass from this discussion, which is indeed somewhat premature, we find Mr. Barclay first, and for a short period, a curate at Bagnalstown in county Carlow, then a missionary of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, commonly known as the 'Jews' Society.' For a period of twelve years (1858-1870), first at Constantinople, then settled at Jerusalem, and after a time minister of Christ Church and head of the Mission there, he seems to have laboured steadily, faithfully, and with some degree of success.

limited indeed, but not altogether unsatisfactory, the circumstances of the Mission being taken into consideration. The same could not be said of the work in Constantinople. 'No harvest of souls whatever was gathered from the sixty thousand souls of Constantinople,' says the biographer. The most interesting passages of this part of the memoir occur in an account of a tour through the Crimea, which he took to throw off the effects of an attack of fever. This is his account of Sebastopol in 1860:—

'In the evening the steamer entered the harbour of Sebastopol. He was struck by the scene of utter desolation and ruin which met his eye. On the one side the forts were little better than a mass of *débris*, remaining as they were left after they had been blown up by the allies. On the other, Forts Constantine and Michael still reposed in sullen defiance, as during the war, blackened only in some places by the smoke of their own guns, which had been driven back by the wind. Inside the harbour, the masts of the sunken vessels, including those of the 'Twelve Apostles,' were still visible above the water. The aspect of the town was exceedingly dismal. Roofless houses, walls shattered by cannon-shot, which were sometimes embedded in the more solid structures, and whole streets, apparently little better than a mass of rubbish, all told the effects of the siege and the ravages of war. The building which had been the great military hospital was torn open and split in every direction, remaining as a withered and blasted monument of the fierce passions of man' (p. 144).

Thence he went to visit the scene of the battle of the Alma:—

'The distance was twenty-five versts, and on the way he passed a new Greek church, which was being built to commemorate the soldiers who had fallen during the siege. The party reached the Alma about noon. After partaking of some refreshment in a little shop kept by a Greek, in a village on one of its banks, Mr. Barclay went forth to explore the place where the battle had been fought. Passing through rich vineyards, and crossing the stream which was now nearly dry, he saw the steep muddy heights close to the sea, up which the French soldiers had forced their way to attack the Russians in flank. The sloping grounds where the English Guards advanced to assail the enemy posted on the crest of the ridge lay before him, and he was able to picture to himself, in imagination, the progress of the conflict. He saw the long pits filled with the dead, attesting alike the fierceness of the struggle and the extent of the carnage. As he went along he picked up the helmet of an officer of dragoons, which had been pierced through and through, the bullet having entered at the brass plate in front, going through the skull, and coming out behind' (p. 144).

In
This
mem
there
memo
the d
in on
certai
repres
on thi

'It
charge
on the
are un
them,
repres
ment.
the Mi
is an e

In
pected
himself
It was
incom
mitted
succes
can ha
particu
work i
wrote

'It
He was
whom
not onl
exempl
persecu
those w
thither
departm

It mus
were d
the So
sense
seem t

In the year 1865, during a visit to England, he married. This part of his sojourn in the Holy City, it will be remembered, fell under the episcopate of Bishop Gobat; but there is scarcely any mention made of the Bishop in this memoir, probably because there was not found to be any in the diaries on which it was founded. Dr. Barclay mentions in one place, when writing to the Secretary of his Society, that certain visitors 'maintain that the English Church is not fairly represented here,' which was in all probability the case; and on this the biographer remarks with some reason:—

'It is difficult to determine from this the exact nature of the charges against the Mission, except that it was avowedly conducted on the principles of one of the parties into which clergymen at home are unhappily divided. As far as it was the outcome of any one of them, it could not be considered as fairly, or, indeed, in any sense, representing another, which never gave it any support or encouragement. If this were the charge, it obviously confutes itself. Whether the Mission fairly represented the Church in her corporate capacity is an entirely different question' (p. 254).

In 1870 he resigned his post, suddenly and unexpectedly, though we are to suppose that it was a step he had himself long contemplated. 'He could not live on his salary.' It was probably a pity that a great and rich Society (whose income, we are told, in 1870 was 38,400*l.*) should have permitted themselves to lose the services of an able, faithful, and successful agent for a mere question of salary; but outsiders can hardly be aware of the whole of the facts of the case, particularly at this distance of time. As to the success of his work in Jerusalem, his successor, the Rev. William Fenner, wrote that:—

'It appeared to him to be in a decidedly flourishing condition. He was not prepared to meet with so large a body of proselytes, of whom some occupied good social positions, and not a few were men not only of consistent walk and conversation, but also of sterling and exemplary piety. Their number and influence protected them from persecution, and constituted what he called "a moral shelter" for those who were inquiring their way to Zion with their faces turned thitherwards. The Mission was thoroughly organized, and every department of it was in full operation' (p. 370).

It must in fairness be borne in mind that these good results were due to Dr. Barclay's personal zeal and industry, and to the Society whose agent he was; and that they can in no sense be credited to the Anglican Bishopric, which does not seem to have been so influential a factor even as might have

been expected under the most unfavourable conditions, in the history of the Mission.

His curacy at Westminster, and his tenure of the small rectory of Stapleford, Herts, present no point for comment. In 1879 he was nominated by Lord Beaconsfield to the Anglican Bishopric of Jerusalem. After his consecration he left at once for his diocese; reached Jerusalem at the end of January 1880; and in October 1881 an Episcopate, which was in some ways unusually promising, was terminated by a sudden and premature death.

Before closing this review of the history of the See, we propose to give some statistics of the condition of the Mission shortly after the death of Bishop Barclay. It must be borne in mind that it is, in fact, an association of three distinct missionary agencies, that of the London Jews' Society, the Church Missionary Society, sent out in 1851, and the British Syrian Schools, a network of educational institutions of which the beginning was made by Miss Bowen Thompson in 1860.

Taking the two former together, we find that in 1882 there were of European missionaries 12, and lay agents 17; native and Hebrew Christian clergymen 6, and native agents of various classes, 65; in all, 100. There are counted as 'adherents' 1,681 persons, of whom 328 are communicants. Besides these there are 65 schools in Jerusalem and other towns in Palestine, attended by 4,463 scholars; and the 'Medical Mission' in Jerusalem, which is a distinct organization, though supported by the same (the Jews') Society, has a medical staff of six persons, and reports 409 in-patients and 7,479 out-patients as having been attended.¹ The 'British Syrian Schools' have their headquarters at Beyrout, where there is a Training Institution and Day School, with branches

¹ A third and very interesting sphere of activity is afforded by the increasing influx of Jews from other countries into Palestine as colonists. A correspondent of the *Record* wrote from Jerusalem in October 1883 the following account of one such: 'The most interesting event of the month in connection with mission work here is the acquisition of an estate by the Jewish Refugees Aid Society. It is situated at Artuf, a village lying at the foot of the Judean hills, in the Shephelah, or low country, between them and the great plain of Philistia. The colonists have already gone to take possession, and as the season for the early rains is close at hand, a great deal has to be done in a short time in order that sowing and ploughing may be proceeded with as soon as the land has been moistened and become ready to receive the seed. The spiritual care and oversight of the colony is being provided for by the London Society's agents. This attempt to form an agricultural colony of Jews in Palestine differs in some respect from those that have preceded it. No other has been so closely connected with a Christian mission.'

at I
Coel
pers
all,
adu
four
Bey

the
hist
tinu
case
the
ther
the
dec
stros
orig
dec
reas

Gest
Cl

In a
itself
all o
little
advoc
no i
mod
will
hard
brou
every

1
Co.,

at Damascus, Mount Lebanon, Mount Hermon, Zachleh, Cœle-Syria, and Tyre. The European staff numbers 17 persons, the native teachers 97. There are thirty schools in all, and the 'highest entry' of scholars of all kinds (some adult), that is, the numbers on the books, is 3,330.¹ Of the four really independent German congregations at Jerusalem, Beyrout, Alexandria, and Cairo, we have already spoken.

United as all these works are by the slightest of ties to the See of Jerusalem, of which we have been tracing the history, we imagine that the question whether it shall be continued or no affects them but remotely. They will in any case go on independently of it as long as the Committee of the Jews' Society shall think proper; and it would be difficult, therefore, to make out any substantial plea of necessity for the consecration of another bishop. Whether, however, the decision be to abandon the See as an ecclesiastical monstrosity, or to continue it from respect to the memory of its original founders, and as a mark of international courtesy, the decision ought to be openly and definitely taken, for assigned reasons, and that without much further delay.

ART. V.—HUMAN PROGRESS UNDER CHRISTIANITY.

Gesta Christi; or, a History of Humane Progress under Christianity. By C. LORING BRACE. (London, 1882.)

IN a time when the early history of institutions is winning for itself increasing regard, it would be strange if the Church in all or any of her aspects should escape investigation. And little ground of complaint is alleged on the part of her wiser advocates against those writers who examine her claims with no intention of supporting them. The fearless spirit of modern inquiry, if allowed its course with equal fearlessness, will become in the end of advantage to the Church. It is hardly possible that any new charge can be sustained, or even brought, against her; she has heard and seen all assaults of every kind of foe, material and spiritual; and the scars and

¹ Hechler's *Jerusalem Bishopric, Documents, &c.*, p. 47. Trübner & Co., 1883.

indentations of her front have not made her weaker in the world nor less venerable to her children. Mr. Brace, indeed, is careful to distinguish Christianity from the Church; sceptics, he thinks, have often been nearer Christ than professed believers, while the Christian Church has favoured practices and encouraged institutions which have been a travesty on the teachings of its Founder and an offence to every feeling of humanity. He has divested himself of much reverence for the 'so-called Church of Christ on earth,' and would fain protest against it in the ears of others. To him the visible Church represents often anything but the Image of Christ; 'at times it is filled with bigotry and hate, it implants persecution in Roman law, it encourages frightful religious wars, it opposes liberty of thought and the investigation of science; its skirts are stained with the blood of the Inquisition and wet with the tears of millions of victims of the slave trade; it encourages war, and is often only an emblem of power and lust and ambition.' It were no difficult task for an apologist, of moderate learning and rhetoric, to answer all these charges; but in truth the best reply to them is the witness of a nobler life in the Church. And, in singular blindness to his own self-contradiction, the writer of the *Gesta Christi* has expanded a multitude of testimony to the overthrow of his introductory *caveat*. There is a platitude of remonstrance against ecclesiasticism no less than a platitude on its behalf. The opening pages of Mr. Brace's book read like the marks of early prejudices, which remain an unerring indication of a protesting school; but the drift of his whole volume is in the opposite direction, though the author be carried thither unawares. To confuse Christianity with the Church may be a theological as well as an historical error, but to separate them is like an attempt to divide a *persona*. And Mr. Brace's knowledge of Roman law might have saved him from confounding ecclesiastical institutions with the human hands which administered them.¹

Our readers will by this time feel assured that in the pages of *Gesta Christi* there are no strained arguments and factitious evidences for Christianity. Rather is it that in the orderly unfolding of this very sober brief unbelievers have already heard an unsuspected and often unwitting defender of the faith. Nor would we wish the case from such a quarter to have been presented otherwise. Its very weaknesses are those of omission, and an adversary could hardly

¹ Sandars' *Institutes of Justinian*, Introduction, p. xxviii.

fail to
which
volum
its lin
meth
excel
put f
ment
versy
of Ch
ful th
Mini
less
defen
divin
weigh
just r
ninet
spirit
before
on th
For c
is in
first
potest
regar
chapt
lation
U
besto
tion o
conde
laries
are ci
its fir
ficient
shown
ing av
its de
Co
posed
Mr. B
'not t
done
we ca

fail to notice how far from being exhaustive are the pleas which Mr. Brace has here made. Our hope in bringing his volume forward is that a further contention may be made on its lines. The book is so wonderfully suggestive that in its method, though neither in scope nor execution, are assuredly excellence and desert. Not one volume but a series could be put forth, with a silent argument from their temperate statement of results which should have no little weight in controversy with the hostile or indifferent. For the modern strife of Christianity with unbelief there is no weapon more powerful than the effect of Christ's manifestation in the world. Minimized as this has been to its narrowest limits by relentless critics and profane historians, the arguments for its defence too often admitted, or feebly contested, by orthodox divines, there yet remains so much for the impartial mind to weigh and consider that it seems not over bold to prophesy a just reiteration of the question where even the morality of nineteenth-century infidelity would have been without the spirit of Christianity and Christ. The plan of the work before us is an investigation of the influence of Christianity on the habits and customs, laws and morals of mankind. For convenience, though not quite accurately, the research is in three divisions of time—early, middle, and late. In the first or Roman period examination is made of the *patria potestas* and the effect of Christian teaching and practice with regard to the position of women, children, and slaves. Minor chapters treat of human jurisdiction and reformed legislation.

Under the second head are described the increasing honour bestowed upon women, the restraint of private war, the abolition of torture, the recognition of strangers' rights, and the condemnation of wreckers and pirates. The Caroline capitularies, the West Saxon dooms, and other Teutonic law books, are cited as effects of religious force; education is traced from its first beginnings in the schools of the Church to the magnificent foundations of colleges and universities; slavery is shown as changing into serfdom and the latter gradually fading away; the Christian ideal of chivalry is declared even in its defects, much more in achievements of pity and purity.

Coming down to modern times, the third section is supposed to 'enter on firmer ground;' and here, in the opinion of Mr. Brace, the weak point which strikes the candid inquirer is 'not that Christianity has done what it has, but that it has not done a great deal more.' It might be suggested to him that we cannot now see the wood for the trees. Being closer to

the actors, ourselves partakers of the events, judgment concerning act and agent alike must be left to a future time. But no amount of hesitation or detraction can nullify the record which is already discernible of these works done in the name of Christ. The condition of women and children has risen to complete emancipation; international law, or the positive morality which claims that loftier name, has been accepted if not enforced between belligerents; the whole arena of war has been purified from its more cruel attendants; the slave trade and slavery itself have been virtually abolished; reformation has been made in the treatment of prisoners, paupers, and lunatics, the aged and infirm; there is even human progress among peoples non-Christian and anti-Christian. These are the chief heads of Division III., than which, for things both said and unsaid, no part of the book is more lively of suggestion: the attitude of Christianity, for instance, as opposed to the pitiless demands of modern science and to the disintegrating and destructive tendency of modern politics.

Turning to Period I., it seems to us that the work of Christianity in the Roman world might have been more vividly described by contrast of the new power with the old—the power of suffering, and of purity, enduring the impact of persecution and unsympathetic law. It is fairly easy for those who are well informed in ancient history to recall the outlines of imperial Rome, or even to fill in the huge picture, and feel once more the *umbra nominis Romani*. But the author of *Gesta Christi* has endeavoured to instruct those to whom he appeals; and these have need of a better understanding of the opposing forces, while the learned amongst his readers would not have disdained a recapitulation of affairs. It would have been no useless introduction had the weakness and afflictions of early Christianity been in part at least described; nor should the later tribulations have been omitted if the greatness and endurance of Christian work had to be comprehensively set forth. The call of Christ was simply the beginning of sorrow; never from the first was there really peace in the Church, or a time for growth and expansion of powers such as an ordinary institution had demanded. Private dislike to converts was widened by sectarian animosity into public hatred, raising at once a barrier in Jewry against Christian influence too formidable to be broken, much less overthrown. A contagion of mistrust spread through the empire, resulting in two centuries and a half of deadly persecution. From the first under Nero to the last under Diocletian an

'inn
that
of se
forti
worl
their

Chri
his c
sugg
the i
and

potes

Rom

Two

ceed

strab

for

Chri

offen

befor

an in

capri

cipat

was

Thos

iuris

of th

into

full a

his le

and

could

The

purif

offen

man

reck

freed

horro

show

spons

and

and

dom,

'innumerable host' of martyrs had arisen, an army so vast that it had to be classified as of the clergy, of the monks, of soldiers, of virgins. And yet from these in their heroic fortitude was issuing that spirit which should change the world; their patience was the solvent of Roman power, if their meekness were not its ultimate ruin.

Mr. Brace unerringly points to the first great result of Christianity in its limitation of paternal power; only we think his case would be more effective had he shown, as we have suggested, the difficulties of the Christian commonwealth and the immemorial greatness of the institution which it modified and eventually destroyed. The extreme rigour of the *patria potestas* had indeed relaxed through all the later periods of Roman society, and even before the famous provision of the Twelve Tables concerning a triple sale juriconsults had succeeded in mitigating its severity. Great changes demonstrably were made under the first emperors; but it was reserved for Justinian to show plainly the softening influence of a Christianized society. No extreme punishment for domestic offences was any longer permitted; the culprits had defence before a legal tribunal. No father could compel his child to an immoral life; marriage could not be forbidden by parental caprice. Sale was become a mere form of adoption or emancipation, rapidly falling into disuse; and the consent of a son was necessary before he could be adopted into another family. Those who were advanced to the grade of patrician were *sui iuris*, and the father could no longer seize upon the acquisition of the child. The *castrense-peculium* of Ulpian had developed into the *quasi-castrense*, and over this Justinian gave the son full and testamentary power. In short, the direct tendency of his legislation was to ameliorate the practical slavery of wife and child. Nor, in the equitable modifications of Roman law, could similar changes have occurred in a like space of time. The breath of Christianity is even more discernible in the purification of domestic life, the banishment of unnatural offenders, and perhaps above all in its recognition of the bondman as a brother and oftentimes a son. It were hard to overreckon the good deeds done in the name of Christ which freed the slave and put an end gradually and for ever to the horrors of the bloody sports, the human sacrifices, the licentious shows. The cruel tasks of an imperial villa, forced by irresponsible masters from defenceless hands; the chance of life and death, of torture and mutilation, all were changed slowly and surely under Christian influence and compassion; serfdom, and mingled free and unfree service of the later manor,

mark in no little sense the obligation due to religious houses and obedience to Christian rule.

But at the best the work of early Christianity was bestowed on a decrepit society. The Roman world, decaying and waxing old, was ready to vanish away. In its midst, however, belonging to it yet not of it, were the representatives of younger nations—'barbarians' and 'mercenaries'—hardier of body, nobler of mind. What the power of a Christian life was to these, what the purity of Christian example, cannot be counted by arithmetic nor tabulated for a statistical age. We know at least in sum how Christianity affected their brethren as they swarmed through and over the provinces, and on to the imperial city itself, till it too capitulated, almost without a struggle, to the victorious Goths (A.D. 408).

Henceforth a new field was open to Christian effort, a new dominion, the heirships whereof remain in the Church to the present day. 'It was fortunate,' says Mr. Brace, 'for the future of Europe that the elevating power of this religion came to aid the German habit of purity and estimate of woman before Roman and Greek vices had sapped the Teutonic character.' The stability of modern society, and the force unquestionably present in the European races of to-day, are due, he thinks, to the teachings of Christ acting on German barbaric virtue and respect for women; while in chivalry itself he traces the Christian motive and cause.¹

The institution of the *Treuga Dei*, and the immense concession made thereby to the Crusade of Peace, rightly demand a separate chapter (xiii). The *pax Romana* may be cited by the Christian apologist as at once an illustration of supreme power exerted under the best heathen rule, and a comparison for effect and result with one only of the beneficent achievements of Christianity. From it have naturally sprung the wider hopes of universal peace, and incidentally the later attempts at arbitration, the abolition of private war, and almost, if not altogether, the cessation of duelling.

The same spirit of humanity was opposed to the wager of battle, the ordeal and expurgation. If the Church were at first inclined to recognize the judicial duel, and its attendant acts, as a solemn appeal to the God of judgment, she soon perceived how unspiritual it was to attribute temporal adversity to the anger and curse of Heaven. Here her mistake was, in

¹ 'The age of chivalry,' according to Bishop Stubbs, 'was only a reign of useless and extravagant humbug' (Lecture at Oriel College, Oxford, Dec. 2, 1871); but Mr. Brace's careful estimate of it (p. 253 *et seq.*) seems more just and sympathetic.

acco
was
evi
tion
time
inco
was
justi

a dr
Teu
only
lette
all t
essen
crim
prot
think
but
with
tribu
heat
Chri
Ages
to he
anity
do n
Chri
Nor
thirt
Chri
unde

N
we an
anity
Chur
again
indiv
the C
yet th
diver
'the

1 V
Vanda
Freder

accordance with the nations among whom her lot especially was cast, a purely human error, of no lasting consequence for evil ; one condemned, moreover, by the tenor of her constitution, though the fact was not understood sufficiently for a time. A darker shadow of rebuke must rest upon her for the incorporation into her canons of so much of the civil law that was unworthy of her own conceptions, alien even to the fierce justice of the new courts of the West.

Torture, however limited by Christian emperors, remained a dreadful feature of Roman law ; it was repugnant to the Teutonic codes,¹ hardly permissible in any of them, and if so only for a time ; never allowed in England, according to the letter of the statute law. But in defiance or forgetfulness of all this, in opposition moreover, as Mr. Brace allows, to the essential spirit of Christianity, torture regained its place in criminal procedure, and yielded only to centuries of Christian protest. The misguided office of the Inquisition should, we think, have been considered as no outcome of the Church, but a fancied political necessity of harsh and cruel times. It, with the Puritan reprisals, should be classed among the later tribulations, the foremost of which was the scourge of the heathens by land and sea. And just as in earlier days Christianity met and overcame her afflictions, so in the Middle Ages ; though by no measure of justice can they be attributed to herself. The Albigensian war is often charged to Christianity and the Papal spirit of intolerance and greed ; but we do not jest with terms when we say that it was in no sense Christian, though S. Dominic marched in the first crusade. Nor does the defence of the Dolcinists, later on, in the thirteenth century, afford a capable brief to the assailant of Christianity, though again we condemn the war against them under the iniquitous Clement V.

Nor can it be objected to us that, while on the one hand we are careful to enumerate all the achievements of Christianity for good, we are anxious to disown the evil acts of the Church. For our contention is that although Christianity again and again may have been distorted by the actions of individual professors, though at times the great consensus of the Church may have been given to the execution of wrong, yet this is not even corruption of the faith, but an absolute divergence from its most emphatic teaching ; a holding of 'the truth in unrighteousness,' mysteriously regnant for a

¹ Visigothic, Lombardian, Ostrogothic, Burgundian, Riparian, Vandalic, or Saxon ; as also to the feudal codes of Jerusalem and Frederick II.

time. And it is no measure of inequality if the credit for good be claimed by Christianity itself, while the charge of evil actually wrought, or of good left unwrought, should be borne by the failing members of the Church, who of themselves, without her leaven, had perchance been guilty of worse things.

But we pass on to notice briefly the beneficent influence of Christianity on the laws of wreckage and piracy, observing in particular the difficulty experienced in our own jurisprudence of effacing what seems to have been the innate love of Englishmen for plunder on the sea. Mr. Brace might have quoted the famous law of Henry II. which saved from wreckage any derelict that had even a dog alive on board, and the further acts of mitigation under Richard I.¹

There is, again, ample room for enlargement in the consideration of early English law, the recognition of customs, hardening into case law and precedent, themselves removed by a growing spirit of Christianity from the stern and simple rules of Saxon and Danish doom-books. And a further point might have been made of the constant appeals in equity from the sentences of common law to the milder overruling of the chancellor, based on the maxims of canonists and civilians. *Nolumus mutare leges Angliæ* was a time-famous cry; but the authority of immemorial decisions drawn from the great unknown, the case book *in nubibus*, was in simple fact a further appeal to the equity of canon law, itself a Christianized recension of the civil codes.

Of the Church's part in education Mr. Brace has written *suo more*. Lamenting 'her bigotry, intellectual narrowness, and one-sidedness, her opposition to science and freedom of thought, her cruelty towards those of differing opinion and indifference to intellectual activity, and her want of charity,' he would not, for all these errors, forget her 'great services to intellectual progress.'² Without the work done painfully in cloister and cell, and without the influence of monasteries and churches, 'Europe would have sunk into a yet darker ignorance, and we might have had in Germany, France, and Italy the history repeated of the Byzantine Empire, a degradation and ignorance which would require the shock of foreign conquest to dispel and remove.'³ It were tedious to follow with a right apportionment of blame all the faults so grievously alleged; but a measure of the Church's work may be seen by contrast with the results of the Renaissance. The

¹ Lingard, ii. 146-147.

² P. 218.

³ *Ibid.*

evils, positive and undeniable, of neoplatonism and revived heathenism should teach the thoughtful how far and from how vast an ocean of corruption the true *magistri* of the Church had saved the Western world.

In the modern period Mr. Brace enlarges with entire sympathy upon the final emancipation of women. Naturally as an American he is more than satisfied with the part his own legislation has played herein. At times there is a grotesque assembly of witnesses to the good cause, as, *e.g.*—

'Women are now being appointed for the State Boards of Charity, the School Boards, and similar important public organizations' (p. 297).

But, since we quote that, we are bound in fairness to praise the chapter (xxiv.) as a whole, and to transcribe its closing words:—

'If, as often seems, a night of scepticism in America and Europe is to descend upon the most generous minds among the men, women will still keep lighted the torch of faith and guide the race till the morning shines upon all. Whatever position woman holds in civilized society is clearly a fruit of Christianity. Even should, by evil chance, Agnosticism at length become for a time the creed of the world, Christian traditions would long survive. But if after the lapse of ages all men and all women should live "without God and without hope" in the world, and the Christian "good news" be as a long-forgotten, once-welcome sound of Sabbath bells heard in a dream, and reverence for anything supernatural have faded away, and the ties of earth be but the accidental bonds of beings soon to disappear, and the unselfish living for others an "altruism" to end in nought in a few days, then will woman become but as a weaker fellow animal, with no especial respect encircling her, and perhaps herself will lose the purity and sanctity which made her under Christianity the object of so much reverence.'

And there is a further prophecy that, without a reaction from such degeneracy, the human race itself must die.

Several of the earlier divisions of the book are dealt with again in their latter aspect. International law especially claims a prominent place; but it needs a citizen of the United States to believe that public opinion, 'if the Christian Church were finally aroused to its duties,' would render any war difficult, if not impossible. The enforcement of the decrees of any court recognized throughout the world would of itself lead to war on no small scale.

Nor can we admire the spirit in which the next chapter (xxviii.) treats of slavery and the slave trade. From the earliest days of emancipation in the Church, and the practical

fulfilment of apostolic teaching in alleviating the lot of the unfree, Christianity has proved itself humane as well as Divine. It has nowhere provoked a servile war; it has said little even on the burning question of miscegenation. And the most cruel oppression has not seldom come from sects outside the Church's pale.

In the reforms of prisons, the treatment of crime as an heredity and disease, in the organization by charity of societies for help in case of need, there is room again for a larger postulation on behalf of Christianity than Mr. Brace has made. The subject-matter is for many persons uninviting, but the result in the hands of a patient compiler would be of lasting importance.

Co-operation and pauperism are even less attractive; free trade and what is oddly called 'humanity between nations' might have been omitted altogether; nor can so ambiguous a term as 'Liberal Government' go forth unquestioned amidst the results of Christian faith and work, though indeed we are forewarned that 'Christianity in itself teaches nothing in regard to any particular form of Government.'

Perhaps the marks of human progress among non-Christian people are considered with scarcely requisite knowledge. No advocate of Christianity need disparage the creeds of China, India, and Arabia. Mr. Brace's supposition is

'that there was not in themselves and their doctrines sufficient of the life-giving impulse or of Divine power to overcome the selfishness and indifference of men; so that as ages go by, and civilization advances, those religious or moral beliefs no longer greatly influence their believers and are poorly adapted to the condition of the world.'

It may be urged, as the writer allows, that the followers of Gautama and Confucius have no more lived up to the principles and teachings of their masters than have the disciples of Christ; but the highest actual results of Brahmanism, Buddhism, Confucianism, or Islâm, are far beneath those of Christianity; while the possible achievements of Christianity rise immeasurably above the potentialities of all other religions in the world.

The summary of *Gesta Christi* may be expressed in the words of its author, that in Christianity '*is a moral force producing certain definite though small results during a certain period of a time*,' and '*of a nature adapted to produce indefinite similar results in unlimited time*.'

He has 'shown what improvements in human condition

¹ P. 469.

and what assistance to humane and moral progress have originated in a comparatively brief period from Christianity.' He infers 'what it will probably bring about in a very long period;' and he argues backward therefore that the Christian religion is 'absolute and universal,' and that its Founder was Divine. In short, he defends the old position that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ, the Son of God; for otherwise He was deceiver or deceived, neither of which alternatives can be maintained in opposition to the works recorded in His name.

For our own conclusion we would urge that evolution and the laws of heredity are wholly insufficient to 'declare His generation;' if His own explanation of Himself be rejected there is no natural solution of His Being, nor of the place which He has won in the story of the world. And it is only in the revolt from heathenism, and not as its result, direct or indirect, that we may account for Christianity and Christ. To gainsay either the *Res Gestæ* or the Person from whom the motive thereof came is impossible in the face of history; to deny His Godhead leaves no less a difficulty—the 'solitary grandeur' and unique completeness of the Lord Jesus Christ.¹

Enough has been said with regard to the purpose of this book and its general effect to commend its argumentative value as a whole. Exception must be taken to some of its statements, and to not a few of its opinions; specialists indeed might have been concerned with the preparation of its several parts, and we have no desire to blame the imperfect accomplishment of that which must be almost impossible for a single hand. But if material were gathered of the kind exemplified in Mr. Brace's volume, and after the order therein displayed, a new apology might in God's providence be formed, at no great future, by some master mind.

¹ Cf. Newman Smyth, *Old Faiths in New Light*, p. 167.

ART. VI.—THE CHURCH IN OLD LONDON.

1. *Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense: an Ecclesiastical Parochial History of the Diocese of London.* By RICHARD NEWCOURT, Notary Public. (London, 1708.)
2. *The Domesday of S. Paul's of the Year 1222.* By WILLIAM HALE HALE, Archdeacon of London. (London, 1858.)
3. *Registrum Statutorum et Consuetudinum Ecclesiæ Sancti Pauli Londinensis.* By WILLIAM SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D., Librarian of the Chapter. (London, 1873.)
4. *The Conquest of England.* By JOHN RICHARD GREEN. (London, 1883.)
5. *Ninth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.* Part I. (London, 1883.)

THE history of the Church in London is almost as much overlaid with legend and conjecture as the history of the city itself. Where the ascertained facts are fewest the guesses are boldest, and the manifest fabrications most misleading. Many have accepted the letter of Pope Eleutherius and the story of King Lucius. Only a few years ago the church of S. Peter upon Cornhill was the scene of a mock festival in honour of its foundation seventeen centuries before. As a fact there are good grounds for looking on S. Peter's, in spite of its dedication, as one of the later parishes. The evidences for the existence of Christianity in Roman and British London are of the most slender character. Bishops from York, London, and Caerleon attended the Council of Arles in 314. Roman London was walled in by a Christian emperor. Some few Christian interments have been found. It would be difficult to add to this meagre list, for though it is of course certain that the Romans and Britons of the fourth and fifth centuries were at least nominally Christians, it is equally certain that so far as London is concerned their memorial is perished with them; and putting aside the single and unsupported case of S. Peter's, no church in London has made even a claim to represent an ecclesiastical foundation older than the Saxon conversion.

Two kinds of Church, however, are before us as to the condition of the Church at an early period, or at least at a period very remote from the present. Besides the well-known

sto
of
Jar
are
Ecc
doc
the
the
Ma
with
hist
city
com
nam
inti
up
form
tual
stor
deac
Pau
son,
volu
them
Mr.
worl
doubl
I
toric
grap
Lon
goss
and
man
scien
been
negle
than
kind
lame
an o
grou
hill,
ancie
apart

story of Mellitus and his expulsion, the subsequent mission of Cedd, the simony of Wina, and the reconversion under Jarumnan, all of which, with apparently a perfect list of bishops, are preserved in the regular chronicles, beginning with the *Ecclesiastical History* of Beda, we have the most valuable documents preserved in the library of S. Paul's, documents the very existence of which was till lately unsuspected. In the *Ninth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts*, Mr. H. Maxwell Lyte has presented students with a list of 'those manuscripts which throw light on the history, manners, architecture, and ancient topography of the city of London;' and, as he has, notwithstanding the necessary compression of his notes, given us as many local and personal names as possible, this list will be found, without any more intimate acquaintance with the original parchments, to clear up many very difficult questions, to confirm some previously formed theories, and at the same time to dispose very effectually of a large number of the loose guesses and legendary stories to which we have referred. Dr. Hale, the late Archdeacon of London, published some selections from the S. Paul's manuscripts as far back as 1858. Dr. Sparrow Simpson, the present chapter librarian, has edited more than one volume from them. Newcourt must have had easy access to them when compiling his *Repertorium*. Yet it is evident from Mr. Lyte's calendar that immense stores yet remain, unworked mines of precious historical material, which will, no doubt, before long be accessible to every student.

Besides the documentary evidence afforded by these historical records we have another source of information. Topography, which has hitherto, especially in connection with London, been too often a mere vehicle for the conveyance of gossip and personal anecdote, may now take rank as a science and the map is as often in the hands of the student as the manuscript. It is possible to overestimate the value of this science. Some very curious and unfortunate mistakes have been made by trusting it too implicitly. But it must not be neglected; and cautiously dealt with it is the helpmate rather than the handmaid of history. An excellent example of this kind of historical method was afforded in the labours of the lamented John Richard Green. When Green was puzzled by an obscure passage he would say, 'Let us walk over the ground.' The configuration of the earth itself, the slope of a hill, the winding of a stream, to say nothing of the aspect of ancient buildings, reveal secrets to the competent investigator apart from the kind of inspiration to be derived from viewing

the actual scene of an event, which no amount of book learning alone will tell him. In London this branch of inquiry is very important. The geographical features of the site are by no means clear even now. And if we attempt to study such recondite subjects as the meaning of parochial and municipal boundaries, or the evidences of priority of settlement or of the density of population, or the determination of distinct holdings by the remaining local nomenclature, the problems which immediately present themselves to the mind, and which it is but too evident must in most cases remain unsolved, affect the student with an impression of constant discouragement very detrimental to the progress of inquiry.

In a brief paper like the present it will be sufficient to state a few of these problems, with, if possible, their solution, and to choose examples as different as may be within the limits of early Church history. If we take a map of the city and colour on it the parochial divisions, or even a portion of them, some surprises result. Suppose, for example, we colour all the parishes dedicated to All Saints or All Hallows with, say, blue: we find a small isolated patch just within the city wall on Tower Hill; another and much larger portion close by round the church of All Hallows Barking; a smaller district north and south of Fenchurch Street, with the site of the destroyed church of All Hallows Staining. Other blue patches occur at a greater distance, such as All Hallows the Great, on the Thames shore, and beside it All Hallows the Less; All Hallows Lombard Street; All Hallows-on-the-Wall; All Hallows Honey Lane; and All Hallows Bread Street; the last two situated close together. Further, let us observe that without the wall is the great East End parish of All Hallows, or All Saints, Stepney, better known by its later dedication to S. Dunstan. The western borders of this great parish are divided from the All Hallows within the wall only by the two S. Botolphs, a comparatively late dedication, at Bishopsgate and Aldgate. If we look at the divisions of these parishes within the city, again, we find a certain number of them which are only separated by short distances, the intervening parishes being of comparatively late dedication. Should we make a bold guess and take All Hallows-by-the-Wall to be a distant district of a great parish which extended from the river on the south to the wall on the north, it will not, perhaps, be any grave violation of historical probability. On the contrary, the more the subject is examined the more likely it seems to be that at an early period the city was in much larger parochial divisions than when it emerges on the page of

docu
of AL
to ma
S. Ma
which
recen
Peter
S. Ga
conne
brings
mothe
Olave
leave
S. Jan
being,
Aldga
parish
TH
from
built a
the D
S. Bot
Priory
Outwi
wall.
repres
on tha
thirtee
tradist
known
S. Dur
Mary's
to S. M
well t
parish
All Sa
covered
to Step
A l
examp
period
and 'th
one, an
not as
by are

documentary history. To take a closer look at this very case of All Hallows, we find the parishes we should have to include to make good our theory would be S. Ethelburgha, S. Helen, S. Martin Outwich, all three of them districts the origin of which is known on historical grounds to be comparatively recent; with these must come—alas for King Lucius!—S. Peter upon Cornhill, and the late-sounding names of S. Dionis, S. Gabriel, and S. Dunstan—a dedication which suggests its connection with All Saints, like S. Dunstan, Stepney. This brings us down to the river bank, and to make up our theoretic mother parish of All Hallows we have only to include S. Olave, which is evidently a late dedication. We can afford to leave the three S. Katherines and S. Andrew alone, but S. James, Duke's Place, only dates from the reign of James I., being, in fact, the precinct of the old priory of Holy Trinity, Aldgate, abstracted about the year 1115 from a neighbouring parish, probably S. Botolph.

This brings us at once to documentary as distinguished from topographical evidence. We know that a church was built at Aldgate by Syred, a canon of S. Paul's, mentioned in the Domesday Survey. This church was either turned into S. Botolph Aldgate, or became the chapel of the Augustinian Priory. S. Martin Outwich represents the estate of the Outwich family, and is partly within and partly without the wall. S. Peter upon Cornhill probably, almost certainly, represents the 'soke' of the bishop, and was separated either on that account or at the settlement of ward boundaries in the thirteenth century. S. Dionis Backchurch—so called in contradistinction to All Hallows Lombard Street, which was known as Forechurch—is one of the Archbishop's peculiars; S. Dunstan's is another. S. Gabriel's was originally called S. Mary's, and, as Newcourt conjectures, its full dedication was to S. Mary, S. Gabriel, and All Saints. This answers very well to the probability we have mentioned that all these parishes are subdivisions of one great parish dedicated to All Saints, which at the first institution of parishes may have covered the whole eastern part of the city and have extended to Stepney beyond the walls.

A little westward along the river's bank we come to another example of the same dedication. Although at some remote period this western All Hallows was divided into 'the Great' and 'the Less,' there can be no doubt that at first they were one, and it is interesting to remark that the two together are not as large as even the modern All Hallows Barking. Close by are, to the eastward, two other very small parishes, S.

Laurence Pountney and S. Martin Orgar; and to the westward, all along the river's bank, S. Martin Vintry, S. James Garlickhithe, S. Michael Greenhithe, and others, which gradually increase in size as we get nearer to the Fleet. There even appears on the map to be a fixed point round which the smallest parishes seem to cluster. That point is the foot of London Bridge. A very similar cluster of little parishes is round S. Paul's; and Green, whose premature death prevented his fully carrying out his researches on the subject, suggests that it is to Erkenwald and his immediate successors 'that we must attribute the little ring of churches and parishes—such as S. Augustine, S. Gregory, S. Benet, and S. Faith—which show a growth of population round the precincts of the minster.' He adds in a foot note, 'The dedications to S. Augustine and S. Gregory bear evidence of close association with the conversion of England. S. Benet's or S. Benedict's recalls the fact that it was during Erkenwald's episcopate that the Benedictine rule first began to make its way in England.' Though we can account for the small parishes about S. Paul's by this theory, it does not help us in other places. But on going further into this most interesting chapter (*Conquest*, c. ix.) we find the distinct assertion that 'this early London grew up on ground from which the Roman city had practically disappeared.' The small parishes exist where population was thickest, along the river bank, at the foot of the bridge, near the market place, and round the cathedral church. A borough sprang up 'between the Poultry and S. Paul's,' perhaps round the King's Palace, the chapel of which became eventually the Church of S. Alban. While western London was growing, London east of the Wallbrook remained comparatively bare. The one monument east of the brook which Green would attribute to this period is the Church of S. Swithin. 'Bishopsgate ward,' he observes, 'which consists simply of that street, with the houses on both sides of the road, still more clearly looks back to a time when the lane to the gate was a mere double line of houses running through the area as yet unoccupied.' And he might have added that the parishes bordering the road point in their dedications to the same period—S. Botolph's, S. Ethelburga's, S. Helen's, and another S. Benet's. Of course all churches dedicated to S. Dunstan must be later than the date of his death, which was 988. By constant examinations of this kind and by careful sifting it might be quite possible to arrive at a clear idea of the geographical distribution of the London parishes in their earliest form. The successive changes took place at such epochs

as the
trad
fires
rural
to a
port
of I
man
their
from
mur
mar
Wal
S. M
the
the
part
chur
that
them
mar
be c
chur
Arch
porte
S. M
refer
T

a ste
'littl
In th
conta
Com
relati
S. TH
Wha
found
in da
relati
relate
life.
is, the
given
in the
Paul's

as that of the rebuilding of the Roman wall, or the revival of trade under Ethelred, or the Danish conquest, or the great fires of 1087 and 1136. The rebuilding of the wall divided the rural All Hallows at Stepney, if we may revert once more to a well-worn example, from the smaller but more important All Hallows within the wall. Erkenwald, as Bishop of London, probably owned both when he gave the urban manor to Barking Abbey. When the Wessex kings took up their abode in London they brought the cult of S. Swithin from Winchester, where he had died in 862. When the Danes murdered S. Alphage at Greenwich they recommended the martyr's name to the Londoners, and S. Alphage-by-the-Wall must date after 1012. Canute and his family introduced S. Magnus, S. Olave, and possibly S. Bride. The great fires, the first of which, some time between 1085 and 1088, burnt the cathedral church, and the second, in 1136, the greater part of the city, led, no doubt, to the founding of new churches, and it is probably to one or both of these dates that we may assign the Archbishop's peculiars, almost all of them late, to judge by their names. Thus S. Mary-le-Bow marks the introduction of stone building, and the 'bow' may be either the Norman arches which still exist under the church, and give their name to the court of the Dean of Arches, or else the flying buttresses which formed or supported a spire like that which Wren placed on S. Dunstan's. S. Mary Staining and All Hallows Staining may perhaps be referred to the same period.

Thanks to the researches of Mr. Lyte, we are able to go a step further back in the history of some members of that 'little ring of churches and parishes' which surrounds S. Paul's. In the list of documents belonging to the Dean and chapter contained in the *Ninth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, Mr. Lyte describes (p. 61 *sqq.*) a series of records relating to the churches of S. John Zachary, S. Peter Cheap, S. Thomas Apostle, S. Antonine, S. Augustine, S. Benet Paul's Wharf, and others. It is interesting to note the names of founders: and as many of these documents are very little later in date than the Conquest they are among the oldest records relating to London which are known to exist. Some of them relate to the grants of churches to incumbents or vicars for life. Thus 'Ecclesia Sancti Benedicti super Hetham'—that is, the hythe or wharf afterwards known as 'Paul's Wharf'—is given to Algar the priest for a yearly payment of two marks in the time of the celebrated Ralph de Diceto, Dean of S. Paul's. There are older grants than this. One or two of

them may be briefly noticed. The Church of S. Edmund, in Lombard Street, had apparently been built and endowed by a certain Daniel, who became its priest. He gave it to the Dean and chapter on condition that his son 'Ismael' should succeed him and hold the incumbency for life. The agreement is witnessed by the Dean, Hugh, the predecessor of Ralph de Diceto, who held office from 1160 to 1181. The names of some of the other witnesses are curious. One is 'Henricus filius Episcopi,' another 'Ricardus frater Archidiaconi.' Among the laity are 'Willelmus Albus' and 'Willelmus bonus animus,' a name which appears in another document as 'Gotsaul.' A second FitzBishop appears as grantee of a wharf by the side of the Church of S. Benedict. Under Dean Ralph the chapter grants to Brithmar the land previously held by 'Edwardus cum barba.' The next document is witnessed by 'Richard Tortus-nasum,' the next by 'William Oculus-latus,' and Gilbert 'Prutfot' appears as sheriff very early in the twelfth century. A sheriff in the troubled times of Henry I. and Stephen had no doubt considerable power, and Proudfoot, either by a legal decision or by actual robbery, took a piece of ground from the Dean and chapter, as they indignantly complain in one of these documents. Nicknames like Goodsoul, Good Christian, Crooked-nose, White, Wide-eyed, Proud-foot, and others which we meet with, such as 'Drinchepig,' sometimes written 'Drinchepinne,' which probably refers to the peg or pin in a drinking vessel, soon turned into surnames, and some of the strangest of them survive to the present day. Stow says of S. Osyth's church that it was rebuilt or repaired, or otherwise benefited, in the reign of Edward II. by Benedict Shorn, corruptly called Shrog or Shorehog. When Stow makes a guess he is very often wrong, as, for example, in his guess about Holborn. In one of these deeds, which is dated 1122, we have the name of a witness Fulk of 'Sancta Osyda;' in another, of equal age, we have 'Willelmus Serehog et Tomas frater ejus.' As this latter document refers to the Church of S. John 'super Walebroc,' Serehog probably lived close by, and therefore close to S. Osyth's, and was no doubt the rebuilders. The new dedication gives no clue to the date. If the older church was dedicated to the saintly queen by Erkenwald, the church as rebuilt was dedicated to S. Benedict, whose rule was introduced under the same bishop. Stow makes no attempt to guess at the derivation of the name of 'S. John Zachary,' and does not even mention that it was dedicated not to the Evangelist, but to the Baptist. The manuscripts at S. Paul's

cont
the g
two
chur
the p
it is
cumb
by C
They
S. M
S. O
A
may
oddy
built
frequ
Unle
same
was b
appe
the g
son-in
Aiiwi
before
reeve
as it
charg
gate.
guild
in 112
built
agree
of S.
theref
he wa
alread
other
Hugh
one of
Mann
of Den
Willia
at the
seated
ment c

contain many references to it, and one of them is a copy of the grant of the incumbency to Zachary for a payment of two shillings, which he was to make annually in 'the mother church.' This way of describing S. Paul's certainly favours the presumption that the chapter had built the church, and it is remarkable that the document is witnessed by the incumbents of other churches which on the theory put forward by Green were also built by the authorities of S. Paul's. They are Osbert, priest of S. Alphage; Robert, priest of S. Mary; John, priest of S. Faith; and Unfred, priest of S. Olave's.

A curious little piece of social and ecclesiastical history may be gathered from the documents relating to another oddly-named church, S. Martin Orgar's. S. Martin's was built and endowed by an eminent citizen who is very frequently mentioned in the records of the twelfth century. Unless two different and closely connected persons bore the same name his history seems to have been briefly this. He was born soon after the Conquest, the son of Manwina, and appears to have been wealthy and to have been a member of the great Knightenguild, of which Ailwin FitzLeofstan, his son-in-law, the husband of his daughter, was also a member. Ailwin and his brother Robert were the sons of a man great before the Conquest, when he was head of the guild and portreeve of London. Orgar bore the surname of 'le Prude,' or, as it is also written, 'le Proud,' and at his own costs and charges built not S. Martin's only but S. Botolph's at Billingsgate. It is usually said that the members of the Knightenguild became together canons of the priory of Augustinians in 1125. If so Orgar may have retained certain property and built these churches after he became a canon. In a deed of agreement by which he grants them to the Dean and chapter of S. Paul's he is described as Orgar the deacon, and he was therefore not in priest's orders. When he went into the convent he was accompanied, among others, by Osbert Drinchepinne, already mentioned, by his son-in-law Ailwin, and by three other aldermen of wards—namely, Ralf, the son of Algod; Hugh, the son of Ulgar; and Algar 'Secusune,' described in one of the documents at S. Paul's (*Report*, p. 66) as 'Algar Manningestepsune.' With them was another Orgar, the son of Dereman, perhaps the same Dereman or Deorman to whom William the Conqueror addressed a brief charter, which is now at the Guildhall, and who was the progenitor of a family long seated at Highbury in Islington. What influence the retirement of so large a number of influential citizens may have had

upon the subsequent history of London we cannot inquire here, and no historian has recorded it for us, but we may observe in passing that a great change in the municipal constitution, the change marked by the elevation of Ailwin's son to the newly established mayoralty, followed within a few years. When Orgar gave his churches to S. Paul's he stipulated that though they were eventually to belong altogether to the capitular body he was to retain them for life on payment of 'ii solidos et xii denarios' at the Feast of S. Paul, and of 'xxii denarios' at Christmas; and further, after his death two of his sons, Walter and Hervey, were to retain them for three shillings to be paid on those days, and the churches were, thirdly, to go to a son of Walter (Hervey was apparently in orders) and to a son of Christina, the daughter of Orgar, but not the daughter, it seems, who married Ailwin. Indeed, it seems likely, from Ailwin's accompanying his father-in-law into the cloister, that his wife was already dead. In course of time these terms were disputed. Orgar's sister, Eadild, was a tenant of the Dean and chapter, from whom she rented a house which must have stood on part of the site of the Bank of England, since it was opposite the church of S. Margaret, Lothbury. It was built on an acre of land which the Dean and canons had bought for twenty-six marks which they had paid to Orgar's son and to the two sons of Leofstan the portreeve.

But a sister of the younger Leofstan—a daughter, that is, of Orgar—probably Christina, afore mentioned, brought a claim against the chapter for a larger payment. She alleged, and assembled certain of her family to join her, that her aunt's house, for which five shillings a year was paid, had been bought not for twenty-six marks but for fifteen. The case appears to have come before Gilbert Proudfoot, 'Vice-comes,' and he gave judgment against the Dean and chapter, for which, no doubt, it is that he is named in one of their records as a spoliator, and they had to make a further payment to the family. They gave accordingly eight marks to Leofstan the younger, one to Robert FitzLeofstan, one and a half to Ailwin, his brother, two shillings to the sheriff, to Azo, who had succeeded his father, Reinmund, as alderman of the ward, two shillings, to Leofstan's sister two more, to another alderman three shillings, to Vitalis, the sheriff's clerk, fourpence, the same to the beadle of the ward (there were beadles even then), and to the schoolboys, who were witnesses of the settlement, threepence for cherries. The Dean and chapter had no further trouble about the acre of land on which Eadild's house stood;

but t
after.
daug
marr
Boko
of hi
his v
and
inspe
noun
of th
celeb
agre
whos
he w
sixth
hims
later

V
becau
typic
we h
spars
men
Abbe
of wh
Orga
ated
which
up, s
them
One
whos
many
the t
whos
gates
we c
bless
chap
feel c
minis
chap
Orga
disap

but the churches did not come fully into their hands till long after. Some time between 1180 and 1187 Christina's daughter—we are not told the name of Christina's husband—married a member of the Bucuinte or Bokointe family. John Bokointe became a sheriff in the third year of the mayoralty of his wife's cousin Henry FitzAilwin. In conjunction with his wife, Dionisia, he brought an action against the Dean and chapter for the advowson of Orgar's churches; but on inspecting the charter of the lady's grandfather they renounced the suit, and the canons agreed 'to inscribe the obit of the said John and Dionisia in their martyrology and to celebrate it and the obit of Ordgar faithfully every year.' The agreement is witnessed by William FitzYsabel, another sheriff whose name is revealed for the first time by Mr. Lyte, though he was known to have been sheriff afterwards in FitzAilwin's sixth mayoralty, by 'Henry FitzLefstan,' the future mayor himself, and by several citizens whose names occur a little later as sheriffs.

We have gone at some length into this story, partly because it is not only one of the earliest but one of the most typical examples of the beginnings of a London parish. First we have the great mother parish, probably All Hallows, but sparsely settled, and all the property of the bishop, who commences to disintegrate it by giving a portion to Barking Abbey. Next we see it broken up into smaller portions, two of which become the manor or aldermanry of a city magnate. Orgar is not content that his estates, on which doubtless, situated as they were close to the bridge and the great highway which led up from it, a large population had begun to grow up, should be without church accommodation. He separates them from the mother parish, and he builds the two churches. One of them he dedicates to the great saint of Touraine, whose name was just then held in special veneration, and many of whose countrymen were actually living in London at the time. The other he dedicates to the East Anglian saint, whose churches already stood at the northern and eastern gates of London, so that pilgrims to Botolph's town—which we call Boston—might commence their journey with his blessing. Finally he grants his foundations to the Dean and chapter, that they may pray for his soul, and that he may feel certain that for all future time a priest will be provided to minister to his tenants and their descendants. The Dean and chapter of S. Paul's still hold the advowsons of S. Martin Orgar's and S. Botolph Billingsgate, though the churches have disappeared. Both were standing in Stow's time, and he

describes their monuments, but they were burnt in the great fire of 1666 and were never rebuilt.

The subdivision of large parishes probably ceased with the passing of the Act known as *Quia emptores* in 1290. But we cannot doubt that a large number of churches were built, like Orgar's and Sherehog's and Daniel's, about the same period by the lords of manors, sokes, or wards within the city. Such names as S. Benet Fink, S. Nicholas Acon, and S. Andrew Hubbard, S. Laurence Pountney, S. Catherine Coleman, S. Margaret Moses, S. Mary Mounthaw, S. Mary Somerset, and S. Nicholas Olave, all evidently point to the foundations of private benefactors; and there are many cases in which these founders are well-known historical characters. Some of them—in fact, a considerable number, to judge by the records—were themselves the first incumbents, and left their endowments to their sons. Of S. Mary Magdalene, Milk Street, there is a royal charter, quoted by Newcourt (i. 470), in which Henry I. desires the Dean and Archdeacon to give the church its own parish, and an agreement follows in which Galfridus, a canon, is named as 'owner' of the church, and his son Bartholomew is named as his successor. That the clergy were often married, more or less illegally, is well known. Walter Map, who lived at the very time at which so many of the documents referred to above were written, has satirized the married priests very unmercifully in more than one of his poems. Mr. Lyte has calendared a large number of references to the families of priests. A very early deed relates to the estate of one Waco, a priest, which descended to his daughter and her husband. Ælis and Felicia were the daughters of William the clerk of Willesden, and had some land from their father. They were living about 1240, when they and their sons, both named William, joined in selling it to John the son of 'Germon, the parson of Willesden, elsewhere called the 'chaplain.' Jocelin was the son of the priest of S. Edmund's, Lombard Street, and claimed the incumbency on the ground that he was his father's heir. A priest named 'Deormannus' is described as 'filius Leofredi presbyteri.' The agreement mentioned above between the relatives of Orgar the Proud and the chapter of S. Paul's is witnessed among others by Richard, the son of Richard the Archdeacon. We have several times the name of Walter 'filius episcopi,' and Henry 'filius Roberti episcopi' was prebendary of Mora. In a charter apparently as old as 1111 we have as a witness 'Johannes filius decani,' and still earlier a dated charter records the grant in 1103 of some land to Lyveva, the daughter of Colsuenus, a

cano
com
gone
the c
more
certa
mon
advic

V
ment
cling
been
one c
and l
agree
who
agree
B, fo
awar
of no
as fro
we ob
desbu
Map
two s
know
The p
'corp
for ev
and t
reside
Simp
as the
how
body
T
turies
canon
his su
sembl

canon of S. Paul's, and her father and brother join in the compact. These cannot all be cases in which a father has gone into orders after the birth of his child or children. After the edict of Innocent III. in 1215 no doubt married priests were more rare, but at the beginning of the twelfth century it is certain that many of those who were not connected with a monastic house, and especially parish priests, followed the advice which, according to Map, was thus given :—

'Paulus cælos rapitur ad superiores,
Ubi multas didicit res secretiores,
Ad nos tandem rediens, instruensque mores,
Suas, inquit, habeant quilibet uxores.'

Walter Map, as a canon of S. Paul's, enjoyed for endowment a farm in Willesden, and the name of a villa, Mapesbury, clings still to the spot. The manor of Willesden, which had been a possession of S. Paul's from time immemorial, and was one of the estates assigned for the provision of the daily bread and beer of the Cathedral establishment, was in 1150, by an agreement among the canons, divided among certain of them who up to that time seem to have had no endowment. The agreement is preserved in two books (liber L, fo. 57; liber B, fo. 35) in the library of S. Paul's, and has not, that we are aware, been printed. Mr. Lyte passes it altogether as a thing of no moment. Yet its exact wording would be interesting, as from the assignment of the different small farms or estates we obtain the derivation of such names as Brownswood, Bron-desbury, and Chamberlainswood, which still occur as prebends. Map let his portion as a farm of twelve acres to a farmer for two shillings a year and a fine of ten shillings. For aught we know to the contrary Mapesbury is still held under this lease. The power of successive prebendaries to make away with the 'corps' of their prebend, as Newcourt calls it, by these leases for ever soon led to the practical disendowment of the stalls, and the prebendaries strove to obtain the appointments of resident canons, or 'stagiaires,' which were well paid. Dr. Simpson gives many curious regulations as to the 'stationarius,' as the stagiar was called in Latin, and the result is to show how entirely irregular was the government of a Cathedral body on the old foundation.

The canons of S. Paul's in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were neither more nor less than country squires. The canon was a great man in his own neighbourhood, owing to his superior learning. In other respects he must have resembled altogether the lords of the manors among whom he

took his place. At that time he was as a rule in deacon's orders only, and even deacon's orders were not absolutely necessary. When Bishop Richard de Belmeis was appointed Bishop of London in 1108 he received ordination as a priest from the Archbishop of Canterbury, S. Anselm, at Mortlake, 'in Pentecost, and was consecrated by him in his chappel at Pageham, July the 26th following.' When his nephew of the same name, who was actually Archdeacon of Middlesex at the time, was appointed to the see in 1152, he was ordained a priest at Oxford by Archbishop Theobald on September 20, and consecrated seven days later. It is probable, therefore, that a majority of the canons of S. Paul's in the twelfth century took no higher orders than that of deacon, and resided as little as possible in the neighbourhood of the cathedral church. When a bishop or a dean was to be elected, no doubt they came to London, and it is rather as 'electors' than as priests or monks that we must regard them.

It is not known at what period the prebendal manors of S. Paul's were acquired. They are certainly among the oldest of Church estates. The charters showing gifts by Ethelbert, Athelstan, and other early kings are now considered medieval forgeries, but there can be no doubt as to the great antiquity of some of these holdings. At what period certain lands were attached to each of the thirty stalls is unknown; but in part at least the system was as early as the Conquest, for in Domesday Book several canons are mentioned as holding land of this kind. As Archdeacon Hale points out, 'to the prebend denominated "*Consumpta per Mare*" lands were at one time attached in the parish of Walton-le-Soken, the catastrophe denoted by the name of the prebend having been supposed to occur about the time of the Conquest.' The income of most of the prebendal manors was at first probably quite sufficient 'to render the majority of the prebendaries indifferent as to obtaining that increase of their incomes which was afforded by residence at the Cathedral.' The rents once fixed were in most cases fixed for ever, and an increase was only to be obtained by new enclosures and by letting the lands in demesne. The canons had no cure of souls. Their manors differed in no respect from those which were in lay hands. 'It is remarkable,' says Archdeacon Hale, 'that neither the Exchequer Domesday nor the Domesdays of S. Paul's contain any evidence that the ecclesiastical manors had any superior religious privileges, or were the centres from which religious knowledge was diffused to the neighbourhood.' In many cases these great lords of manors must have owned

188
sla
po
the
est
lor
less
is o
Mo
' A
thin
rec
fari
cart
120
the
nos
was
men
sur
Ber
the
of w
plac
sugg
Bar
the
Rich
the v
have
' nat
to th
Gilb
mitt
time
and
S. M
of th
infl
farm
the r
lands
muna

1
makes
questi
VO

slaves. 'It is doubtful,' observes Dr. Hale, 'whether a lord possessed a greater property in the servus than is implied in the obligation on the part of the servus to dwell upon the estate, and not to depart from it without the license of the lord.' There are several notices of the sale of slaves, doubtless for manumission, among the records at S. Paul's. One is dated on the morrow of the Ascension in 1191. Hamo de Mora sells to the Dean and chapter Alwine the lame, 'Alwinus Claudus,' of Cronmere, and all his boys and everything he has, in consideration of sixty shillings which he has received from the treasurer and from John 'de Hospitali,' the farmer of the Cathedral manor of Ardleigh, and of a horse and cart and twenty-eight sheep. About the same time, or before 1204, the Bishop of London gives to Ralph de Diceto and the chapter 'Johannem fabrum de Fuleham, filium fabri nostri de Fuleham.' It is not very clear that manumission was here intended. The descendant of Deorman of London, mentioned already, who has by this time assumed a territorial surname and calls himself 'Thomas de Barwe (Barrow), filius Bertrami de Barwe,' gives to the Dean and chapter William the son of Reginald de Barwe and all his chattels for a pound of wax. Mr. Lyte is apparently not aware that there was a place called Barrow in the neighbourhood of London, and suggests that William was a relation of the grantor. But Barrow, now called Highbury, is a manor in Islington, and the 'de' is used here in two different senses. A little later Richard Ruffus, Archdeacon of Essex,¹ a great-grandson, by the way, of William FitzYsabel, mentioned above, seems to have bestirred himself in the good case of manumission. A 'nativus' or bondman, 'filium Galionis de Pentalaia,' is given to the canons for two marks paid by the Archdeacon, and Gilbert the son of Alkil, of the same place (Pentlow), is manumitted for one mark. Walter de Windsor about the same time gives Goduin the carpenter and his brothers, Ranulph and Richard, with all their belongings, absolutely to God and S. Mary and S. Paul. In setting an example of good works of this kind the canons of S. Paul's may have used their influence, but in many cases no canon in particular, but a farmer, 'firmarius,' exercised all the rights and duties, paying the rent fixed to the chapter. This was the case with the lands belonging to the common stock and called the 'Com-muna.' On these manors servitude of some kind subsisted

¹ He was an archdeacon, as he signs in that capacity, and Newcourt makes him Archdeacon of Essex, an assumption which Archdeacon Hale questions.

till a very late period, and Archdeacon Hale says a good deal about the 'nativi' of Navestock and the 'Akermanni' and 'Hidarii' of Adulvesnase. The farmer was often, and at a later period always, a canon of the cathedral, and the first choice of a lease was given to the stagiaries. The sons of canons were sometimes chosen for what must have been a lucrative office, and other relatives of members of the chapter also shared in the good things which were at its disposal. The churches and parsonages were often included in the lease. In one manor, Adulvesnase, there were three churches, Walton, Kirkby, and Thorp, and when Richard, Archdeacon of Middlesex, obtained the farm, in or about 1150, it was stipulated that he should keep them free in his own hands, without appointing any parson, so that on the surrender of the lease the Dean and chapter should find the livings vacant. There can be little doubt that this practice was universal. The owner of the manor owned the church and drew the great tithes, appointing a vicar, under conditions. In 1181 the canons of S. Paul's 'derived a revenue from nearly all the churches of their manors.' We have seen how they appointed to London churches in their gift, and both in town and country the vicars paid an annual rent. Some vicars had a glebe, but there was none at Willesden, and in some places the glebe was sufficient provision and there was no tithe. The churches thus served made payments to the canons of various sums, ranging from the two shillings of Wicham or S. Giles's to the twenty shillings of Caddington and the eight marks of Willesden.

The neighbouring 'college' of S. Martin-le-Grand enjoyed a constitution very similar to that of S. Paul's. It had a dean, and in 1158 there were nine canons. A community of interests united the two establishments, and the same individual was occasionally beneficed in both. A number of London churches belonged to S. Martin's, and were no doubt in the same position with respect to their patrons as those under S. Paul's. Newcourt mentions S. Alphage, S. Anne, S. Botolph Aldersgate, S. Leonard in Foster Lane, then called S. Vaste's or S. Vedast's Lane, all near the house, and S. Katherine Coleman and S. Nicholas Coleabbey at a greater distance. We have few records to tell us how the chapter of S. Martin's acquired their ecclesiastical property, but no doubt some churches they built, some were built and given to them by lay owners, and some were bought, as we have seen to have been the case with S. Paul's. S. Leonard's was, we know, built by the canons. Previous to 1236 the parish-

ioners worshipped at the altar of S. Leonard, in the church of S. Martin, just as the parishioners of Westminster worshipped in the church of S. Peter before S. Margaret's was built for them.

We have not touched upon the strictly monastic churches of London, but in several instances the monks had considerable influence on parochial history. The Church of S. Katherine 'Cree,' for example, belonged to the Priory of Aldgate. It had literally no endowment, and was but irregularly served by the canons. It offers a reverse to the cases just mentioned of S. Leonard Foster Lane, and S. Margaret Westminster, for the parishioners were driven to worship at an altar of S. Mary Magdalene, in the Priory Church, and Bishop Clifford had eventually to interfere in order to obtain them their rights.

The smallness of most London churches has always been a matter of remark. It was, no doubt, owing chiefly to the fashion, not to say craze, which every owner of an estate in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries seems to have had for erecting his lands into a manor. The multiplication of churches had its convenience for the inhabitants. The one idea of Church service was the celebration of Mass. When churches were no longer built chantries were founded in the larger churches for the same purpose, but preaching was almost unknown. The friars who came over in the thirteenth century were probably often the first preachers the people had ever heard. Long afterwards London incumbents did not look upon preaching as any necessary part of their duty, and at the dissolution petitions were presented to Henry VIII. praying him to appoint the great churches of the Franciscans and Dominicans as preaching places. When FitzStephen speaks of London as boasting of one hundred and twenty-six parish churches, he probably includes those of Westminster; but the number shows that a majority of the modern parishes were already in existence when he wrote in the reign of Henry II.

ART. VII.

A NEW ATTACK ON THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

An Earnest Remonstrance against the Recital of the Athanasian Creed in our Churches. By a MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. (London, 1884.)

CHURCHMEN must hold themselves in readiness to confront, sooner or later, a renewal of that agitation against the 'Quicunque vult' which was for the time defeated about ten years ago. It is not in the nature of things that the anti-dogmatic party should accept that defeat as definitive, instead of watching their opportunity for a fresh attack. The author of the pamphlet before us is even passionately desirous of contributing to a revival of the controversy, of doing what he can towards the great object of 'silencing' this confession of faith 'in our congregational worship' (p. 2). He places on his title-page, as a motto, 'Quousque tandem abutere, *Quicunque*, patientia nostra?' Thus the 'Quicunque' is at the outset compared to Catiline; on the last page to Goliath, under such vigorous phrases as 'this menacing Philistine,' this 'cursing giant' (p. 54). We do not indeed suppose that the writer represents, properly speaking, anyone but himself, although we have reason to believe that his pamphlet has been widely disseminated among the clergy. Those who act as a party, with a programme to carry out, are not accustomed to put forward as their spokesman, or to employ as their *avant-courier*, a person whose polemic has so marked an individuality, expressing itself in such a flood of coarse invective. The 'Quicunque' is denounced as a 'dogmatizing oracle,' a 'loud and imperious pretender,' an 'incubus,' a 'parody of the Gospel;' its statements are 'man-made puzzles,' an 'oppressive tax on faith,' 'metaphysical subtleties,' 'bald metaphysical formulas,' 'equivocal metaphysical phrases,' 'crude and puzzling metaphysics,' 'false metaphysics,' 'bewildering dogmas,' 'enigmatical dogmas,' 'puzzling thoughts,' 'incomprehensible' or, at best, 'disputable propositions.' It is said to 'prate' as well as to 'threaten.' Its minatory, or, as some would say, its minatory language is denounced with a fury almost too intense to be articulate, as 'harsh' (twice), 'merciless' (twice), 'horrid,' 'horrible' (twice), 'frightful,' 'grim,' 'barbarous' (thrice), 'truculent,' 'chorused anathemas,' 'an outrage on' the Divine character, and so forth. Those who

in 1872-3 set their faces against the attack on this Creed are even described as acting in a 'sanguinary' spirit (p. 52). One is almost reminded of that string of damnatory epithets which Milnwood, in *Old Mortality*, selects from the official account of the murder of Archbishop Sharpe :—

'I think it a—bloody and execrable—murder and parricide—devised by hellish and implacable cruelty—utterly abominable, and a scandal to the land.'

But, seriously, let us remind this 'Member of the Church of England'—presumably a layman, who probably would have much to say against *odium theologicum* and the bitterness of clerical controversialists—that we are not living in the sixteenth nor in the seventeenth century, and that in these days no cause, dogmatic or anti-dogmatic, orthodox or heterodox, ecclesiastical or political, is advantaged by undisciplined wrath, repeatedly becoming, as in the present instance, even grotesque in its vituperative fluency. Setting this point aside, we proceed to give our readers some account of the grounds on which this impetuous writer—who, by the way, is in too great a hurry to spell names rightly, and, incredible as it may seem, writes that of our late Primate as 'Tate' (p. 2)—summons all persons of 'any power or influence in Church and State to co-operate in the good work' of 'silencing "Quicunque."' But here it must be observed that he makes this appeal not simply to members of the Church of England, but to 'English Christians generally,' to all 'the Christian subjects of the Queen' (pp. 43, 53), and yet more comprehensively to 'all good men' (p. 54), and that on the express ground that a 'national Church' ought, according to its 'theory,' to 'arrange that its teachings and worship shall be fairly acceptable to the consciences of the entire nation' (p. 41). How far would such a principle carry its supporters? Who is to judge as to what is 'fairly acceptable'? Have those English Christians who deliberately reject, and are by law free to reject, all obligations to the Established Church, a moral claim to urge their own predilections so as to dictate the character of her teaching or of her worship? Can they in this fashion 'have it both ways,' clutching at more than ecclesiastical privilege while they cast off every shred of ecclesiastical responsibility? The legalization of Nonconformity makes such a pretension inequitable and absurd, even in a merely secular view of justice; and, if it were admitted, it would range far beyond this particular portion of the formularies of a Church which Nonconformists, by hypothesis, disown.

The writer repeatedly disclaims for himself the character of an opponent of the dogmas of the Athanasian Creed. In his own graceful language, he 'would in this case' emphasize the maxim "Let sleeping dogs lie;" he would not 'even disturb men's belief in the dogmatisms in question' (pp. 18, 28). He does not, in the common phrase, 'go for' the excision of this formulary from the Prayer-Book. But we submit that it does not lie in *his* mouth to make this confession. If the statements of the 'Quicunque' are such as, in language already quoted, he asserts them to be, then they are not fit to remain in the Prayer-Book, recited or not recited. He ought, on his own showing, to call for a more drastic measure than the mere cessation of 'recital;' he ought to make war upon that Eighth Article which dogmatically affirms that 'Athanasius's Creed,' like the two others, 'ought thoroughly to be received and believed,' as proveable 'by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.' And we are lost in wonder at the simplicity with which he tells us that as the excision or the verbal modification of the 'Quicunque' might, 'even if possible, involve much polemical discussion, legal difficulty, and Church disunion, he does not plead for any' such course, 'but *simply* for the discontinuance of the form in our public services' (p. 3). Does he think that this 'discontinuance' would involve no 'polemical discussion, legal difficulty, and Church disunion'? If so, in what cave did he spend the years 1872-5?

He begins his regular plea with some 'remarks upon creeds in general;' and is so good as to say that, considering the mischief wrought in early ages by all kinds 'of pernicious theories,' 'it is not surprising that the Church rulers in those days should have raised, in the form of stringent creeds, what they deemed breakwaters against these floods of error;' and that even if in so doing they at all 'restricted unduly the cause of legitimate thought and reasoning, their zeal for the truth and for the peace of the Church may well be accepted as a fair excuse for so doing. But an excuse is one thing, a *justification is another.*'

We do not pause to dwell on the positive helps to worship, to the religious affections, and to Christian obedience, which, as Dr. Newman¹ and Professor Hussey² long ago pointed out,

¹ 'The intellectual expression of theological truth not only excludes heresy, but directly assists the acts of religious worship and obedience.'—Newman, *Arians*, p. 150.

² 'God in Christ, working in the Church for the salvation of man—this is the object of love and of every other emotion of the soul in man, which can be considered any part of subjective religion. But take away

are furnished by such 'outlines of sound words,' or creeds, as were drawn forth from the Church by the necessities of her position and her duty to the souls of her members; nor do we ask who is to be the judge of what is 'legitimate' in the way of theological speculation. But we call attention to an elucidation of the passage just quoted which will be found four pages further on, where the *Nicene Creed* itself is brought up for judgment at the bar of this 'Member of the Church of England.' It is rebuked for 'severe stringency,' for 'the intolerant stringency of its metaphysical definitions;' and we are assured that if the Nicene Fathers had foreseen how 'the dissentients from some points in their dogmas,' provoked by 'the harsh and inexorable way in which' those dogmas 'were enforced, would gain the upper hand . . . and in . . . turn become persecutors of' the orthodox, and how their own 'subtle and severe distinctions would tend,' not to suppress speculations, but 'to stimulate them, and even to increase the number of theorists and disputers, they would doubtless have constructed that Nicene Creed of theirs upon far more liberal principles' (p. 7). In a later passage the 'Homoousion' is called 'that unfortunate word' (p. 20).

This English Churchman, then, is not comfortable whenever he hears the Nicene Creed repeated. Does he himself join in it when he is about to receive the Holy Communion? Does he refuse to utter the phrase, 'of one substance with the Father,' and apparently other phrases too, as being 'severe, subtle, stringent, intolerant,' and thus incapable of 'justification'? Or if he does repeat them, does he accompany this act of conformity with a mental protest? Again, does he know that the Nicene Fathers, as S. Athanasius repeatedly informs us, were at first desirous of using none but Biblical phrases, but soon found that Arian ingenuity could quibble away their meaning, and were thus constrained to use the terms 'Homoousion' and 'from the essence of the Father'?¹ And does he know that, in the years which followed, the Nicene Confession was the one Creed of the Catholics against a long series of formularies emanating from the various schools of Arianism?² No one who knows anything of the history of those times will need to be reminded that the controversy was

any article from the creed or form of words, and you diminish the idea of that which is the object, and thereby contract the range of the emotion.'—Hussey, *Academ. Sermons*, p. 251.

¹ S. Athan. *de Decr. Nic.* 19, 20; *ad Afros*, 5. The latter phrase was omitted in the 'Constantinopolitan' recension.

² Tillemont reckons eighteen such, *Mém.* vi. 521.

inevitable, that a vague creed would have done nothing to allay, and much to intensify it, and that to talk of 'liberal principles' of creed-making, in the sense of a principle which would have provided Arianism with a foothold within the Church of Christ, is to betray either an ignorance of the question at stake, or an indifference to its vast doctrinal moment. 'Is our Lord a creature, or is He Very God?' That, and nothing less than that, was the issue raised by Arianism.¹ To refuse to deal with it, to evade it by indefinite verbiage, would have been clear treason to His cause and His Person—if He was believed to be *God* in the proper sense of that august term. We pass from this point, just reminding our readers that Bishop Gray of Capetown wrote thus in 1872: 'Were the Athanasian Creed set aside, the very same spirit would *next* assail the *Nicene Creed*.'²

The writer proceeds to speak of the 'Quicunque' as having partially found its way into the Psalters of the Gallican Churches in the sixth or seventh century, but not by any competent Church authority, whether central or local. If this is an argument against its use, one might ask him what Church authority originated the Creed which assumes the great name of 'the Apostles'? And he entirely passes over the fact that the 'Athanasian Creed' is in great measure made up of dicta of Fathers chiefly, but not exclusively, Latin. As has been well said, it might be more reasonably called 'the Creed of S. Augustine' than that of S. Athanasius: yet 'Such as the Father is, such is the Son,' is verbatim from Athanasius,³ who also says, 'There is one eternal Godhead in Trinity, and one glory of the Holy Trinity,'⁴ and 'We confess God to be One through the Trinity';⁵ again, 'The Father has from none, but the Son has from the Father,'⁶ and yet again speaks of the Word as 'having taken man into Himself,'⁷ and calls Christ 'perfect God and perfect Man.'⁸ Epiphanius has language very like that of 'So there is one Father,' &c.⁹ S. Basil says that 'it is a duty to acknowledge each Person as existing in a real hypostasis.'¹⁰ S. Gregory of Nyssa says, 'The Father is God, and the Son is God, but God . . . is One.'¹¹ S. Gregory Nazianzen, in somewhat different terms, gives the same warning against Sabellianism and Tritheism as that in verse 4;¹² speaks of 'an Unity as to be worshipped in Trinity, and a Trinity in Unity';¹³ and repeatedly denies, in the spirit of

¹ Newman, *Arians*, p. 260.

² *Orat. c. Ari.* i. 19; iii. 6.

³ *Orat.* iii. 36.

⁴ *Hæc.* lix. 18.

⁵ *Orat.* xx. 5.

⁶ *Life of Bishop Gray*, ii. 559.

⁷ *Orat.* i. 18.

⁸ *Orat.* iii. 15.

⁹ *Orat.* iv. 33.

¹⁰ *Epist.* ccx. 5.

¹¹ *Op.* iii. p. 26.

¹² *Orat.* xxv. 17.

¹³ *Con. Apollin.* i. 16.

verse 25, that any one Person is to be 'put above or below another,' or that there can be 'unequal degrees of the God-head.'¹ Other coincidences of expression might be quoted; thus Pope Damasus writes, 'This is the salvation of Christians, to believe in the Trinity,' &c.;² the Council of Constantinople in 382 guards against the two errors of 'confounding the Persons' and 'dividing the Essence';³ and Cyril in the formulary of reunion with John of Antioch calls our Lord 'perfect God and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and a body.'⁴ It is needless to quote Western Fathers.⁵ It may be said generally that the 'Quicunque,' whensoever compiled, is really Patristic in its substance, and therefore that to haggle about the date of its compilation is, except in an antiquarian sense, a waste of time.

But now the pamphlet-writer comes nearer to the matter in hand. He says that 'the Almighty has not revealed Himself to the extent that this formula assumes.' He sees in the 'Quicunque' a spirit of 'prying philosophical investigation,' of 'merely curious inquiries' on Divine subjects (p. 12). 'Whatever the Bible declares concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and the Incarnate Saviour, it neither offers nor countenances the curious analysis of the Godhead and Immanuel presumed upon in this Creed;' 'the author of "Quicunque" had no right presumptuously to analyse our blessed Saviour in this way' (pp. 12, 26). He adds that 'many venerable Fathers and sincere Christians in the fourth century would have strongly objected to some things in this Creed,' and in modern times he selects two 'illustrious' men, 'both sincere believers in the Bible,' who could not have assented

¹ *Orat.* xxvi. 19, xliii. 30; *Epist.* ci.

² Theod. *H. E.* v. 11.

³ Theod. v. 9.

⁴ Cyr. *Ep. ad Joān.* (Pusey, vi. 44).

⁵ We may, however, give a few references. Compare verse 1 with Fulgentius, *de Fide ad Petrum*, 1; verse 2 with Augustine, *de Fide et Operibus*, s. 1; verse 4 with Aug. *c. Maximin.* ii. c. 22; verses 8 ff. with Ambrose, *de Fide* ii. s. 36, *de Sp. Sancto* iii. s. 109, Aug. *de Trin.* v. s. 9, viii. s. 1, *Serm.* ccxii., *Collat. cum Maxim.* s. 12, *de Civ. Dei* xi. 24; verses 15-18 with Aug. *c. Maximin.* ii. c. 10, *de Trin.* vi. s. 10; verses 19, 20 with Aug. *de Civ. Dei* x. 24, *c. Maximin.* ii. c. 23; verse 23 with Aug. *c. Maximin.* ii. c. 14, *de Trin.* iv. s. 29; verse 24 with Aug. *c. Maximin.* ii. 23, *de Trin.* vii. s. 7; verse 25 with Ambrose, *de Fide*, ii. s. 65, Aug. *c. Maximin.* ii. c. 10, *de Trin.* iv. s. 27 verse 31 with Ambrose, *de Sp. Sancto*, iii. s. 168; verse 32 with Aug. *Enchirid.* c. 35, *Epist.* cxl. s. 12; verse 33 with Council of Aquileia in Ambrose, *Epist.* x. 7, Aug. *c. Maximin.* ii. c. 23, *de Trin.* i. s. 22; verse 34 with Aug. *Serm.* cclxi. s. 7; verse 35 with Aug. *de Hær.* lv., *Enchirid.* 34, 36, verse 36 with Aug. *Serm.* clxxxvi. 1; verse 37 with Aug. in *Jo. Evang.* lxxviii. 3, *Enchirid.* 36, &c. S. Leo, too, often reminds one of the 'Quicunque.'

'to some of the Creed definitions.' These men are Milton and Newton. An infelicitous selection, surely; for Milton was an Arian, and Newton's belief has been described as 'scarcely rising to a level with Arianism.'¹

To proceed: 'Obligatory confessions of faith, if they are imposed at all, should be constructed either out of Scripture expressions or their plain equivalents.' How many 'equivalents,' too 'plain' for evasion, could he produce? And he goes on to say that the Latins 'caused contentions' by incorrectly 'rendering *hypostasis* by the word *persona*.' He does not know, apparently, that *hypostasis* was literally rendered *substantia* in the fourth century, and that this prejudiced the Latins against the phrase 'Three Hypostases.'² Then he adds that the 'use, in two of the creeds, of the words "Person" and "substance," is not less a stumbling-block to our faith than it is a puzzle to our understanding' (p. 15).

Mark this new criticism on the *Nicene* Creed. But does it stop at that Creed? Our author is, perhaps, in the habit of communicating on Trinity Sunday; although, no doubt, he is aware that the institution of that festival is mediæval, and he *may* think that an Established Church ought not to retain an observance which may be offensive to a 'respectable' body of English Christians. What does he hear on that great day, when the priest recites the Proper Preface? 'Who art one God, one Lord; not one only Person, but three Persons in one Substance.' And can he echo that fourth suffrage in the Litany which calls upon the Holy Trinity as 'Three Persons and one God'? Everyone knows that the use of the word 'Person' in regard to the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit, is encompassed with speculative difficulties. He tells us himself that many 'good men maintain that the attempt to reconcile the idea of three persons, implying three individual minds, in one and the same substance, or essence, is metaphysically impossible' (p. 18). Dr. Newman long ago described 'the original mystery of the Holy Trinity' as 'that *Person and Individuum are not equivalent terms*.'³ We use 'Person' simply because we must use some word to indicate the truth,⁴ plainly revealed, that the Father, *e.g.*, is

¹ *Christian Remembrancer*, April 1856, p. 367.

² Cp. Jerome, *Epist.* xv. See Newman, *Athan. Treat.* i. 70. S. Augustine intimates that *substantia* might be used as equivalent to *hypostasis* in the sense of a really existing Father, or Son, or Holy Spirit (*De Trin.* vii. s. 8, 9).

³ *Treatises of S. Athan. against the Arians (Lib. Fath.)*, i. 155.

⁴ We commend to our author the consideration of a passage in S. Augustine's fifth book on the Trinity: 'Cum quæritur *quid* tres, magna

disti
one
indio
ear
'Hon
Aria
ciliat
phys
'pers
Abso
tical
repre
there
Livin
belie
there
think
men,
langu
safeg
by th
as qu
the T
That
quest
himse
passa
three
note
are s
in his
the st
'the A
or the
Spirit,
tions v
from c

prorsu
Person
in the
as to t
sitate p
a Sabel

¹ Se
² N
³ Se

distinct from the Son, although the Son is included within the one Divine Being or essence; and as we use 'substance' as indicative of that one Being, although to an ordinary English ear the term may suggest a materialistic notion, just as 'Homousion' did to some Greek ears in the first days of the Arian controversy. And if we come to intellectual 'reconciliation of ideas,' did this writer never hear of the metaphysical difficulty of reconciling the 'infinity' with the 'personality' of God, of attributing 'personality' to the Absolute and Supreme? ¹ We overcome those difficulties practically by remembering that our terms are but proximate representations of the idea which must be retained, and therefore must somehow be represented. We believe in a Living God; and therefore we call Him Personal. We believe in a real Father, a real Son, a real Holy Spirit; and therefore we call Them Persons, although we know that to think of Them as of separate individual beings, like three men, would be Tritheism, against which, in the technical language of theology, the doctrine of the 'coinherence' is our safeguard.² Cardinal Newman appears to be misunderstood by this writer, as if in his notes on the 'Athanasian Treatises,' as quoted by Bishop Kaye, he had explained the Persons of the Trinity to be mere 'relations,' in a Sabellianizing sense. That is not the purport of the somewhat abstruse notes in question, which our author has apparently not consulted for himself. Had he done so, he might have seen that the passage criticized by Bishop Kaye³ not only speaks of the three Persons as 'correlatives,' but refers its readers to an earlier note ('supr. p. 412'), where the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are spoken of as eternally distinct from each other; and so, in his *Grammar of Assent*, the Cardinal strongly enforces the statement that

'the Almighty God is at once, according as we view Him in the one or the other of' His 'three personalities, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, a Divine Three, who bear towards each other the several relations which those names indicate, and are in that respect distinct from each other, and in that alone. This is the teaching of the

prorsus inopia humanum laborat eloquium: dictum est tamen "Tres Personæ," non ut illud diceretur, sed ne taceretur' (*De Trin.* v. s. 9). So in the seventh book, after stating difficulties which might be raised as to the use of 'Persons,' he says we must admit '*loquendi necessitate* parta hæc vocabula' (*ib.* vii. s. 9). Vincent of Lerins guards against a Sabellianizing misuse of *persona*. (*Commonit.* c. 14).

¹ See Newman, *Univ. Sermon*. p. 32 (preached in 1830).

² Newman's *Arians*, p. 178.

³ See *Treatises of S. Athan.* &c., ii. 453.

Athanasian Creed; viz. that the one personal God . . . at once is Father, is Son, is Holy Ghost; yet 'that the Father is in no sense the Son, nor the Son the Holy Ghost, nor the Holy Ghost the Father,' &c.¹

This language may be called hard to follow; it is certainly harder than the language on which our author lavishes the angry words which we have quoted above. As Dr. Mozley has said, nothing can be more inaccurate than to talk of the 'Quicunque' as running out into metaphysical speculations.

'The Creed is metaphysical in the sense in which the doctrine of the Trinity itself is metaphysical; but, the doctrine of the Trinity once assumed, there is nothing added to it, and the exposition adheres as closely as words can do to the original truth, only carrying it through different forms of language. . . . Any one sentence in this whole succession involves every other.'²

The very aim of the formulary, he proceeds, is 'to fix' that doctrine upon men's minds, with a determinate 'uniform impress, sustaining and prolonging the one great doctrinal assertion by forms of statement . . . but not interfering with, but only exhibiting the original truth. But this would have been *prevented* by the introduction of metaphysics;' so that 'it was the very interest of the Creed . . . to avoid metaphysics; speculation was foreign to its aim.' 'Philosophy would have been a great deal in the way.' Accordingly, there is no philosophizing, no theorizing, no attempt to explain how the Three Persons are but one God. In fact, the question lies in a narrow compass. The fundamental proposition of the 'Quicunque' on this subject is, that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and yet They are not three Gods, but one God, according to verses 15 and 16. Each of the statements in this twofold proposition is, says Cardinal Newman, 'capable of being "really" apprehended';³ the mystery lies in their combination, and is impenetrable to our present faculties; in the Cardinal's language, it can only be 'notionally' apprehended. However, a person either believes this proposition in spite of the mystery, or he does not. If he does not, then his quarrel is not with the 'Quicunque,' but with the doctrine of the Trinity itself in its simplest and least technical form; and he has no sort of argumentative *locus standi* as a 'member of the Church of England.' If he does believe it, then he believes also, implicitly,

¹ *Grammar of Assent*, p. 120.

² *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 189.

³ *Grammar of Assent*, pp. 126, 131.

not only
reiterate
24-26, v
add not
further
possess
attribute
We mus
as distin
so as to
'must'
of 'wor
We say
culty in
fault. I
Himself
is afore
idea of
indicate
accusati
the 'Fil
notion o
Son 'Go
the Fat
champi
consiste
proper
difficult
tions of
in them
the Fat
Father a

¹ Ath
² It i
John xiv.
'Quicun
same sen
'Greater
ration fro
S. Athan
there cou
with the
much po
(p. 78)—t
that the
Augustin
not be de

not only the statements in verses 3 and 27, which do but reiterate it, but also all that is affirmed in verses 4-14, 17-20, 24-26, which simply present the idea in different aspects, but add nothing to its substance, and therefore cannot impose any further 'tax' on his faith. Thus each of the Divine Three must possess each of the four Divine attributes specified, but those attributes must not be predicated of three separate Beings. We must not confound the Persons, but must recognize each as distinct from the other: we must not divide the substance, so as to say, 'Three Gods, or Three Lords.' But every such 'must' or 'must not' is wrapped up in the original obligation of 'worshipping one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity.' We say this, not as if forgetting that some might find a difficulty in two passages where it is really our version that is in fault. In verse 19 we ought to read, not 'every Person by Himself,' but 'each Person severally;' and in verse 25, 'none is afore or after other' does not, perhaps, convey at once the idea of 'nothing is prior or posterior,'—i.e., as the next verse indicates, 'the whole three Persons are coeternal.' Coleridge's accusation against the 'Quicunque,' to the effect that it ignored the 'Filial subordination,' appears to be due to a mistaken notion of that 'subordination.' If the Nicene Creed calls the Son 'God from God,' the Athanasian says that He is 'from the Father;' and His Divine coequality, which the great champion of the Nicene faith expressly affirmed,¹ is at once consistent with His derivative Sonship, and essential to His proper Divinity.² But this brings us close to a more real difficulty. Verses 21-23 are concerned with the interior relations of the Trinity; and no Trinitarian will find any crux in them until he comes to the words, 'The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son,' or, more correctly, 'is from the Father and the Son' (*Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio*). Our

¹ Athan. *Orat.* iii. 6; *de Syn.* 49.

² It is true that S. Athanasius, like other Greek Fathers, interprets John xiv. 28, not of the condescension to Humanity, as the author of the 'Quicunque' evidently did, but of the Filial derivation. But in the very same sentence (*Orat.* i. 58) he expressly saves the Divine coequality: 'Greater, *not indeed in greatness*, nor in time, but because of His generation from the Father Himself,' who is the Fountain of the Godhead. S. Athanasius, then, would fully admit that, in regard to essential Deity, there could be no inferiority of the Son. It was, indeed, a main point with the Catholic theologians of his time—as Dr. Mozley shows with so much point and vividness in his *Essay on the Theory of Development* (p. 78)—that there could be no greater or less in Godhead. The doctrine that the Father is the 'principium Deitatis' is as plainly taught by S. Augustine (*de Trin.* iv. s. 29) as by S. Athanasius, and therefore could not be denied by the compiler of the 'Quicunque.'

author, naturally, dwells on this as an assertion of the Double Procession, so called. We do not think that it can fairly be restricted to the 'temporal mission' of the Holy Spirit, because the same preposition is used in regard to the Son, *Filius a Patre solo est*, which, of course, relates to the Divine Filiation. The writer of the passage, in short, meant to state what is called the Latin doctrine, according to which a double eternal procession is inferred from a double temporal mission, and it is argued that 'the Spirit of Christ' or 'of the Son' must be in some eternal relation to the Son, subordinately to His eternal relation to the Father. The inference may well be thought reasonable, although Easterns would hold that it has no due warrant; but, at any rate, it is not logically involved in the fundamental proposition, as stated in verses 3, 15-16, or 27; and it is only to that proposition, and to what is logically involved in it, that the sanctions of the 'Quicunque' on this subject can in fairness be held to apply.

But our author objects to the assertion that 'the Son is eternal.' And here, without knowing it, he draws perilously near to Arianism; for he seems to admit the legitimacy of such an argument as that 'if the Son was eternal, He never began to be the Son, therefore never began to be begotten, therefore never was begotten; for if the generation never began, it never took place.' But this is to turn the 'generation' into an *event*, whereas the Church regards it, in Dr. Newman's words, as 'an eternal and unchangeable *fact* in the Divine essence,' according to that pregnant word of Origen, 'The Saviour is always being generated.' Dr. Newman, in the same passage, says that 'Arius scoffs at ἀειγενής,' and, further on,² that the Arians 'brought forward, in many shapes, the main argument' on which 'their cause turned, "He is a Son, therefore He had a beginning;"' while the Catholics, on the other hand, maintained that this was a *non sequitur* in regard to a truly Divine Sonship. But then, we are asked, why say that the Son was 'begotten before the worlds,' if what is meant is that He is begotten eternally? The phrase 'before the ages,' as we should render *ante sæcula* (verse 31), was of course adopted from the Nicene 'before all ages,' which itself was taken by the Nicene Fathers from the Creed of Cæsarea. Athanasius understood it as contrasting the Word with the things that come to exist in the ages: 'He it is who is in existence before the ages, by whom also the ages came to be,'³ and 'If every interval is

¹ *Treatises of S. Athan.* i. 201.² *Ibid.* i. 274.³ *De Decr. Nic.* 18.

measured
ages' (H
prior to
Eternal o

So m
mystery
we have
with its l
of the M
'absorpti
disclaim
looks as
humanit
stitution
means, o
hood int
it, 'took
'All tha
attached
ing to H
It is to t
human n
lariter as
tration f
Cyril⁴ an
Augustin
and Gre
Cyril, lik
be treat
being m
analogy
in a sing
one is su
wished h
of the P
apposite
the Pers
stained v

¹ *Orat.*⁴ E.g.⁶ E.g.

animal an
He knowe
tions . . .
mirror,' &

measured by ages, and the Word is . . . Maker of all the ages' (Heb. i. 2), 'therefore, since no interval at all exists prior to Him, it were necessarily madness to say, 'Once the Eternal did not exist.'¹

So much as to the doctrine of the 'Quicunque' on the mystery of the Three in One. But our author finds fault (as we have already seen, and shall now see in other instances) with its language respecting the Incarnation also. 'Taking of the Manhood into God' suggests to him the idea of an 'absorption of the man in God'; and this in the teeth of a disclaimer, which he notices, of all 'confusion of substance.' It looks as if he had never consulted the Latin. *Assumptione humanitatis in Deum* (or rather, *in Deo*, by a late Latin substitution of ablative for accusative, as in Vulg. Judg. iv. 9) means, obviously, that the Divine Son, being God, took manhood into union with Himself; as the Christmas Collect has it, 'took our nature upon Him.' In Dr. Newman's words, 'All that is necessary to constitute a perfect manhood is attached to His eternal Person absolutely and entirely, belonging to Him as really and fully as His justice, truth, or power.'² It is to this that S. Augustine refers when he says that in Christ human nature was 'in unitatem personæ unici Filii Dei singulariter assumpta.'³ Again, this writer is very severe on the illustration from the combination of 'the reasonable soul and flesh.' Cyril⁴ and Theodoret⁵ agree in using this comparison, which Augustine had used before them in this and other passages, and Gregory Nazianzen when writing to Cledonius; but Cyril, like every other divine, was well aware that it could not be treated as perfect,⁶ and it is not adduced in this Creed as being more than proximately relevant. That there is *some* analogy between the cases, in that two elements are combined in a single personal subject, is enough for the purpose. No one is supposed to press it further, any more than Theodoret wished his own illustration from the outward and inward parts of the Holy Eucharist to be strained beyond a superficial appositeness. So Epiphanius, after illustrating what we call the Personal Union by the case of a man who is said to be stained with blood because his garment is so stained, adds

¹ *Orat.* i. 12.² *Sermons*, vi. 65.³ *Enchirid.* c. 36.⁴ E.g. *Explan. Cap.* 4.⁵ *Dial.* ii. (Op. iv. 106, Schulze).⁶ E.g. he gives it after the caution, 'Having taken a body with animal and rational soul, and united it truly to Himself, *in what way He knoweth*, for our minds can by no means attain to such speculations . . . but if we must say something, as if seeing through a mirror,' &c. (*Schol.* 27).

the caution, 'No simile . . . can be taken entire.'¹ So, again, Christ's Manhood has been called the 'instrument of His Godhead;' but, as Dr. Newman² has said, it is not 'like an instrument which can be taken up and laid down.' In fact, as Waterland tells us, the misuse of this analogy by the Eutychians made 'the Catholics strangely averse to' it, &c.³ Once more, our critic objects to the assertion, 'God and man is one Christ,' on the ground that "Christ" can only be properly applied to the Man, who was

'constituted the Christ solely by being anointed with the Holy Ghost. If the alleged taking of the manhood into God were the anointing by which He became the Christ, then the definition would be true; but if that alleged taking of the manhood into God did not constitute the anointing, then it is not right to affirm that He became the one Christ by taking the manhood into God' (p. 27).

Now let us look at the context. Its sense is: 'Christ is God and Man; yet though God and Man, He is one and not two, that is, one single Person, not two persons associated together, as the Nestorians held. But how is He one? Not, as some Apollinarians imagined, by the formation of His body from a Divine and not a human substance; nor, again, by a fusion of humanity with Divinity; no, but by His taking our nature upon His very self, and appropriating it to His single Divine Person.' Is it not plain, then, that 'Christ' is here used, not simply for Jesus in that Messianic office on which He entered at His baptism, but for Him as the Virgin-born Redeemer, who, being the Son of God, had become the Son of Man? Then S. Athanasius says that "Christ" indicates two things, Godhead and Manhood; therefore Christ is called Man, and Christ is called God, and Christ is God and Man, and Christ is one.'⁴ So 'Orthodox,' in Theodoret's *Dialogues*, says that 'Christ' denotes the Word as incarnate. It is not meant that He 'became one Christ by taking the manhood into God,' but that, although He had superadded the manhood to the Godhead, He continued to be one, because that manhood was united, as closely as any kind of attribute, to His own Divine Self or Person. It is this 35th verse which ordinary readers find less intelligible than any other, simply because that Apollinarian theory as to the heavenly origin of our Lord's flesh is so very strange to modern apprehensions. In regard to this second part of the 'Quicunque,' as in regard to the first, it may be said that all the doctrinal statements grow out of,

¹ *Har.* lxxvii. 33.

² *Works*, iii. 204.

³ *Sermons*, vi. 64.

⁴ *C. Apollin.* i. 13.

or are c
Jesus C
bona fi
the 'Qu
For if I
independ
in time
God an
God no
stituent
flesh.
there ca
as being
though
singlene
Lord J
dicated.
stood a
either e
promise
both G
new nat
as in t
obvious
things'
Trinity
to be wo
In the c
is one C
believes
and yet
to be G
here req
tion; an
depend
we were
reduplic
two. Y
would r
sublime
We
the anim
unconne
is cause
of those
VOL. 2

or are contained in, one fundamental assertion, 'that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man.' He who *bona fide* believes this, thereby accepts the whole doctrine of the 'Quicumque' respecting the Person of our Blessed Lord. For if He is God, His Divine Sonship must be essential and independent of time; if He is Man, He must have been born in time (*in sæculo*) of a human mother. He must be perfectly God and perfectly Man; for otherwise He would be neither God nor Man. Therefore, *qua* Man, He must have the constituents of true manhood, a reasonable soul as well as human flesh. As being God, He must be equal to the Father, for there can be no such thing as a superior and an inferior Deity; as being Man, He must be inferior to the Father. Again, though He is God and Man, this is without prejudice to the singleness of His Personality; for it is of a single Subject, 'our Lord Jesus Christ,' that the terms 'God and Man' are predicated. But then, lastly, this singleness must be so understood as not to compromise the distinctness and reality of either element in the union: as Godhead would be compromised if it were in any sense converted into flesh, and both Godhead and Manhood if they were fused into some new nature. The fundamental proposition is then re-stated, as in the first part of the formulary; the parallelism is obviously designed. In the one case we read: 'So that in all things' (rather 'throughout') 'the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshipped' (rather 'the Unity is to be worshipped as in a Trinity, and the Trinity as in a Unity'). In the other case the re-affirmation is briefer: 'God and Man is one Christ.' On the whole we may say that if a Christian believes the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to be severally God, and yet not three Gods but one God, and the Son as Incarnate to be God and Man, yet one Christ, he believes all that is here required of him respecting the Trinity and the Incarnation; and the verses which follow (38-41) simply enforce the dependent truths leading on to the future Judgment. If we were to abridge the Creed by omitting its expansions and reduplications, the verses left would be much fewer than forty-two. Yet if the Creed were thus abridged in recitation, would not the ordinary Churchman's conception of these sublime *credenda* lose much of its vividness and fulness?

We fear there is too much ground for surmising that part of the animosity which is felt against the 'warning clauses' is really unconnected with those clauses as bearing upon dogma, and is caused by the emphatic assertion of the eternal perdition of those 'qui mala egerunt.' However, as to the clauses

themselves, which kindle such a white heat of indignation in the writer before us, we must observe that he admits the existence in the New Testament of certain 'warning' texts remarkable for their stringency. He cites Mark xvi. 16, 'He that believeth not shall be condemned,' and John xii. 48, 'He that rejecteth Me, and receiveth not My words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.' But, he says, this and similar texts apply only to

'men who perversely and recklessly allow evil dispositions and motives to prevent their acceptance of our Lord and of his Gospel. . . . Yet even of such God-condemned unbelievers it is nowhere said in Scripture, "Without doubt they shall perish everlastingly." (What of Rev. xxi. 8, which dooms the 'unbelieving' to the 'lake of fire'?) 'But, whatever may be the doom of those who reject the whole Gospel, the case must be vastly different with those who do not knowingly reject God's Word, but only what they deem perversions of His Word' (p. 30).

Now we grant, at the outset, that the interpretation which our author, as a matter of course, puts on this class of texts is in some cases suggested to him by the context. It is so in John iii. 18, 19, and viii. 24, where unbelief is distinctly associated with sin. But in John xii. 48 the menace is more absolute: 'He that rejecteth Me, and receiveth not My words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day.' Now suppose a man were to say, 'This is a dictum that could never have come from the lowly and gentle Prophet of Nazareth, since He could not have thus threatened with condemnation persons who, in "the honest and conscientious use of their reasoning powers," decline to accept His Gospel, because, after examination, they are persuaded that they have no "sufficient grounds" for believing it; yet here He is described as banning them for "honest convictions:"' would not our author tell such a person that of course Christ was speaking, not of all who rejected Christianity, but of those whose rejection had its root in some sin? He would then be putting an interpretation on this warning text; the gloss would be sound and reasonable, but it would be a gloss. If the objector were to say, 'Oh, you are explaining away an obnoxious statement!' might he not rejoine that the 'universal' minatory or 'damnatory assertions' of 'the New Testament have always been, as a matter of course, understood with tacit conditions,' and not 'in the absoluteness of the letter;' and that, so far from such an understanding of them being 'non-natural,' it is rather the 'rigidly literal' or

uncondi
and abs
Mozley
on our a
interpre
'special
tion of v

'How
of the gra
true and
says that
that he is
individual
nasian Cr
whether it
wilful or
or not?
contradict
general la
upon which
hold a rig
ceeds from
eternal co
and as thi
language o
of the Ch
Scripture.'

Where
'wretched
our autho
which is r
cited, but
ing as 'W
God dwell
condition
merely of
fying faith
to use thi
such right
sary to sa
the belie
One Chris
forth in th
matter; th

unconditional interpretation which is 'non-natural, artificial, and absurd'? We have been here employing the words of Dr. Mozley; and we shall use his language by way of comment on our author's denunciation of any qualified or conditional interpretation of the warning clauses, as amounting to mere 'special pleading, evasions, irrelevancies,' 'a sheer contradiction of what' it professes 'to explain.'

'How,' asks Dr. Mozley, 'are we justified in saying that the letter of the grammar is an artificial and false sense in Scripture, and the true and natural sense in the Creed? . . . Does Scripture, when it says that everybody is condemned who does not believe aright, *mean* that he is condemned conditionally, *if* it is his perverseness, *if* it is his individual sin, *if* it is his wilfulness, *if* it is his pride; and does the Athanasian Creed, when it says the same thing, *mean* that he is condemned whether it is his sin or not that he does not believe, whether he is wilful or not, whether he is proud or not, and whether he is perverse or not? Such interpretative judgment would involve a conspicuous contradiction and absurdity. The New Testament lays down one general law upon this subject, and states one fundamental condition upon which all the damnatory language, applied to those who do not hold a right faith, is used; and that is, that the error in faith proceeds from something wrong morally (John iii. 19). The rule of eternal condemnation is here expressly declared to be a moral one; and as this rule of Scripture lies at the bottom of all the damnatory language of Scripture, so it underlies also all the damnatory language of the Church, . . . by the necessity of her very root, which is in Scripture.'¹

Where is the 'sophistry,' the 'discreditably bad logic,' the 'wretched fencing,' in this application to these clauses—which our author, *more suo*, calls the 'curses'—of an interpretation which is not only assumed by all readers of the texts above cited, but also required by such absolute assurances of blessing as 'Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God,' where, of course, the condition is supposed, '*if* his confession be the outcome not merely of an intellectual conviction, but of a living and justifying faith'? Or if it be objected that Scripture has a right to use this 'minatory' language, but that the Church has no such right, the answer is: Scripture makes a right faith necessary to salvation, and condemns those who reject that faith; the belief in the Trinity in Unity, and the belief in the One Christ God and Man, in their logical contents, as set forth in the '*Quicumque*,' *are* that faith in regard to their subject matter; therefore the Scriptural requirement and the Scrip-

¹ *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 198.

tural condemnation apply to these beliefs, and to those who reject them—*i.e.* in the spirit presupposed by the condemnatory texts. If a person denies that they are Scriptural, that they concentrate and secure the purport of Scripture teaching on these high points, the discussion, of course, changes its character; the opponent does not admit what the Church of England in her Eighth Article expressly asserts; it is that assertion, not the 'Quicunque,' that has to be vindicated. Our author does not precisely inform us as to his own standpoint in this matter. He talks of 'the offensive Creed' as 'discrediting the Catholic faith in general.' *Dolus latet in generalibus*: why does he not tell his readers whether or not he accepts the fundamental propositions of the formulary? In short, how much does his 'Catholic faith in general' cover?

If there are many worshippers in our churches who do not see that an equitable interpretation is the one required by such a document as the 'Quicunque,' is it not their pastors' business to instruct them, instead of slurring the question over? Our author makes a point of what he deems the contrast between 'the damnatory words' and the 'Gloria Patri' with which 'the Creed closes.' Does he think that no man or woman in any Anglican congregation ever feels a difficulty in having to repeat the 109th Psalm with the 'Gloria' at the end of it? Is there no need to explain the sense and purport of the Church's use of this and similar Psalms? Again, has he never heard of people absenting themselves from the Communion Service? There ought, indeed, to be more systematic instruction than we fear there is, in our churches, as to the true significance of several parts of the public ritual; and this instruction would naturally embrace the warning clauses of the 'Quicunque.' We say this, not as thinking that these clauses are all worded in the best possible way. If the thing were to do over again, no doubt a due consideration of untheological misapprehensions and prejudices would suggest an express definition of their scope. We presume that not all these five verses, 1, 2, 28, 29, 42, give the same amount of offence. In three of them no positive statement is made as to those who reject the faith; in one of these three, 'must thus think' ought to have been rendered 'let him think,' as Mr. Ommanney remarked in a pamphlet on *The Athanasian Creed*, while rejecting Bishop Ellicott's proposal to render 'salvus' not by 'saved,' but by 'in a state of salvation.' The chief stumbling-block, no doubt, consists in verse 2, which, we admit, goes further than is necessary in order to guard that principle of the necessity of a right belief, which is taken for

granted
word oc
reader th
menace-
of holdi
thing 'e
committ
whatever
has neve
in regard
duly reco
cannot, i
fulness to
unfaithfu
or, as Dr
rule the
apply.'¹

Our
note,' of
'the ana
his state
have of
they obje
metaphy
authority
ley. Bu
nouncing
which he
that faith
phrases'
discussion

'The e
the platfor
as possible
at Jerusale
issued to
generous w
to lay upon
&c. (p. 16)

As if tha
with a qu
Again
minded b

granted in the Ordinal. Still, it is in this very verse that a word occurs which of itself ought to prove to any considerate reader that the warning—or, if people prefer to call it so, the menace—is not aimed at those who have had no opportunities of holding the Catholic faith. For he only can 'keep' a thing 'entire and inviolate,' who has had it in effect adequately committed to his keeping. This clause, therefore, says nothing whatever in regard to those vast multitudes to whom the faith has never been made known at all, and, we must add, nothing in regard to those many others to whom it has never been duly recommended. For where this has not taken place, there cannot, in the sight of a God of equity, be a case of unfaithfulness to the deposit of truth. Who they are that are thus unfaithful, those who recite the verse presume not to judge; or, as Dr. Liddon expresses it, 'no human judgment can safely rule the fearful question, to what individuals these clauses do apply.'¹

Our author scoffs at the admission, in an 'explanatory note,' of 'involuntary ignorance' as exempting a person from 'the anathema.' With the angry dogmatism too natural to his state of mind, he avers that the more knowledge men have of Scripture and of metaphysics, the more stoutly will they object to some sentences in the Creed (p. 51). As to metaphysics, we have already referred to a somewhat higher authority in that line, by quoting some sentences from Dr. Mozley. But as to Scripture, let us test his competence for pronouncing on what is, or is not, Scriptural, by two references which he makes to S. Luke and to S. Paul. In order to show that faith should not be based on 'equivocal metaphysical phrases' (a thesis, as we have shown, quite irrelevant to this discussion), he proceeds:—

'The earnest endeavour of the Apostles was manifestly to make the platform of Christian communion as plain and as comprehensive as possible. This fact was strikingly exemplified by the first Council at Jerusalem. The simple orders which those fathers of the Church issued to Gentile believers were prefaced by these considerate and generous words: "It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things,"' &c. (p. 16).

As if that Council had been called together in order to deal with a question of faith!

Again, we are told that S. Paul advised the 'robust-minded believers at Rome' not to grieve the weak brethren

¹ *University Sermons*, ii. 142.

by exercising their right to eat meats which the latter thought unclean. 'You may reply that eating meats and reciting creeds are different cases. True, but the principles that ought to dominate both are the same, unless you can in this case clearly show that the recital of "Quicumque" is either absolutely necessary or highly expedient.' S. Paul, we may observe, had something to say, in this very Epistle to the Romans, against those who 'caused offences contrary to the doctrine' which the Roman Christians had learned; and his conduct showed that even concession to prejudice in things indifferent must have its limits when a great doctrinal principle was concerned — *e.g.* that a Titus must not be circumcised, lest advantage be given to the 'false brethren' who held a Judaic view of justification. And when our author goes on to say that the use of this Creed cannot be necessary, because 'whatever of essential dogma there is in it is abundantly set forth in the Nicene Creed,' and that 'the Nicene Creed *is* sufficient,' we observe in the first instance, that he omits to tell us what dogma he deems essential; in the second, that such a reassuring remark comes but inappropriately from a writer who had described the characteristic passages of the Nicene Creed in the terms which we have already quoted. This is rather too much like blowing hot and cold. Thirdly, when he refers to the Council of Chalcedon as having forbidden any other creed to be formed or used, he shows that he has not read the context of that prohibition, which related expressly to the 'compilation' of any 'different creed,' for 'presentation to persons desiring to come over to the Church' ¹ — *i.e.*, of a creed for use at baptism, or at reception of converts. We do *not* use the Athanasian Creed for such a purpose, and therefore the prohibition is, so far, *nil ad rem*. Again, this very Council of Chalcedon put forth a formal 'Definitio Fidei,' touching upon heresies which had come up since the 'Constantinopolitan' recension of the Nicene Creed; and Council after Council, in its own sphere, did the like in after-ages, according to the emergencies of the Church. And what does our author say to the Thirty-nine Articles?

He is singularly unable to understand the point of view from which the 'silencing of the "Quicumque"' has been resisted, and will be resisted again. If the matter were not so serious, one could hardly help smiling at the assumption that this resistance is prompted by a mere selfish eagerness to retain what gratifies a personal taste.

¹ Mansi, *Concil.* vii. 116.

'The
is gall
show a
order to
perfect
would it
right?
promote
worship

Truly,
the wr
which I
appeals
dischar
either
philipp
by them

'the first
sense of
it was in
main p
centurie
English
foes of
ing of s
no long
Lord's
sary to
affirmin

So sp
on Oct
fessor
clauses
demna
the cl
the C
Church
a cond
will pr
to give
in orde
shall r
Canno

'The Creed in its entirety may be a perfect luxury to you, but it is gall and wormwood to your brethren. Would it not, therefore, show a worthy Christian spirit to sacrifice a needless gratification in order to save them from positive suffering? You have, it is true, a perfect right to insist upon the recitation; but this being granted, would it not be a most graceful thing to forego the exercise of this right? Would not this concession of brotherly kindness and charity promote your own self-approval, and add to the pleasantness of your worship?' (p. 33).

Truly, an extraordinary passage, which shows how little the writer can appreciate the true character of the forces which he confronts. He does not see that those to whom he appeals believe that they have in this matter a solemn trust to discharge: that the concession which he would fain obtain, either by soft compliments to 'generous' feeling, or else by philippics against 'stern and inexorable obstinacy,' is regarded by them as

'the first great step in a theological revolution. . . . The broad common sense of the people would argue that the Creed was discarded because it was imagined to be wholly or partly untrue. . . . The fact would remain patent to all men that, after using this Creed for the last three centuries on all the greatest festivals of the Christian year, the English Church had deliberately abandoned it; and the friends and foes of faith would alike draw their own conclusions as to the meaning of such a step. It would be inferred that the Church of England no longer held belief in the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and of our Lord's Incarnation, as taught by the Church Universal, to be necessary to salvation, and that she admitted herself to have erred in affirming this necessity since the Reformation, not less than before it.'

So spoke Dr. Liddon from the University pulpit at Oxford on October 20, 1872.¹ Dr. Mozley, speaking as Regius Professor of Divinity, says that the removal of the obnoxious clauses would be in effect, though not in form, 'a judicial condemnatory act on the part of the Church upon and against the clauses themselves;' and that as to the shelving of the Creed itself, 'the undogmatic school will interpret the Church as giving up doctrine when she no longer dare annex a condemnation to the rejection of doctrine; and this school will prize the result.'² To take a yet broader view, if we are to give up all the severer representations of Christian truth, in order not to shock the 'ears polite' of modern laxity, we shall not stop with the surrender of the Athanasian Creed. Cannot this writer understand that there are really a great

¹ *University Sermons*, ii. 138.

² *Lectures and other Theol. Papers*, p. 191.

many persons who recognize an austere but most real charity in warnings against apostasy from that faith whereby God wills to be known? To those who are possessed by so grave a conviction, all this talk about 'graceful concession' and 'kind consideration' sounds purely trivial and childish.

The writer, indeed, somewhat speedily changes his tone of dulcet coaxing for the rougher strains which are more congenial to his mood. And his last page, while it expresses the intensity of his eagerness for the result to which, in spite of past disappointments, he still persists in looking forward, shows at once his imperfect sense of humour, and his conviction that mere persuasions will not do the work. An ecclesiastical dictator, it seems, is required :—

'What is especially needed is a MAN, able, energetic, and influential, to head the movement ; and my great wonder is that no brave and God-trusting David comes forth to slay this menacing Philistine. When will such champion step forth? Whenever he does so . . . with his sling and stone of truth and justice, with direct and unswerving aim, and with energetic action, he will bring the giant down, and his cursing shall cease. Then there will be great joy in Israel, and we shall all feel our brave and good champion deserves our utmost gratitude, and even royal honours. Oh when will the champion appear? We have hoped for him long : is it to be an "eternal hope"? Surely not,' &c. (p. 55).

Comment on this rhapsody seems needless ; but we venture to predict that in this great English Church the fate of a formulary which she calls one of her 'three Creeds' will not be decided by a single revolutionary champion. The 'Quicumque' has outlived many a foe. Its present assailant would probably be amazed at the following estimate of its value :—

'It is not a mere collection of notions, however momentous. It is a psalm or hymn . . . of profound self-prostrating homage. . . . It is the war-song of faith, with which we warn first ourselves, then each other, and then all who are within its hearing, and the hearing of the Truth, who our God is, and how we must worship Him, and how vast our responsibility will be if we know what to believe, and yet believe not. . . . For myself, I have ever felt it as the most simple and sublime, the most devotional formulary to which Christianity has given birth, more so even than the "Veni Creator" and the "Te Deum."'¹

These are the words of a truly great Christian, to whom nothing is so precious as what can bring the soul nearer to its God.

¹ Newman, *Grammar of Assent*, p. 128.

Sin
pamph
S.P.C.
purpor
adopti
stituen
Book.
Mr. O
Comm
'Quicu
as a wh
a Soci
raison
not to
an opi
would
WH
the 'C
Dr. L
Omma
earlier
tion w
strance
scopal
matter
ance o
the da
some c
in a m
affect
not di
been in
Mr
answer
'dictat
'prever
ing to o
the sar
teacher
ing-kni
away so
subject

¹ W
strange
the noti

Since these pages have been in type we have received a pamphlet by the Rev. G. D. W. Ommanney, entitled *The S.P.C.K. and the Creed of Saint Athanasius* (Rivingtons), the purport of which is to complain of the action of the Society in adopting Dr. Lumby's account of the 'Quicunque' as a constituent of their recently published Commentary on the Prayer Book. Disclaiming all intention of censuring Dr. Lumby, Mr. Ommanney expresses regret that the S.P.C.K. Tract Committee should have entrusted the treatment of the 'Quicunque' to a writer who was well known to hold it to be, as a whole, a composition of the ninth century; and that thus a Society which 'by the traditions of its history, by its very *raison d'être*, is bound to uphold the Creeds of the Church, not to undermine them,' has done what in it lay to disseminate an opinion which, if once established in 'the English mind,' would lead to the abandonment of the 'Quicunque' (pp. 7-9).

When the article or section on the Creeds, including the 'Quicunque,' appeared and exhibited a reassertion of Dr. Lumby's opinion without any consideration of Mr. Ommanney's already published arguments in support of an earlier date for the 'Quicunque,' Mr. Ommanney, in conjunction with Mr. Randall and Mr. Pocock, presented a remonstrance to the S.P.C.K., and so indirectly to its five episcopal referees,¹ who answered by practically shelving the matter, and, while guarding themselves from the appearance of agreeing with 'Professor Lumby's conclusion as to the date of the "Quicunque vult," from which, in fact, some of them disagreed, were nevertheless of opinion that, in a matter of historical criticism which did not necessarily affect the doctrine or discipline of the Church, they could not dictate conclusions to a divine of eminence who had been invited to write for the S.P.C.K.'

Mr. Ommanney (not unnaturally, we think) regards this answer as unsatisfactory. It was not, he says, a question of 'dictating conclusions;' it was a question of

'preventing an hypothesis which is not only erroneous but disparaging to one of the Creeds of the Church from being disseminated with the sanction of the S.P.C.K. in a book intended for the use of teachers and students. The referees had already applied the pruning-knife to the Prayer-Book Commentary for the purpose of paring away some trifling inaccuracies on the comparatively unimportant subject of ritual' (this is an allusion to the harsh treatment which

¹ We wonder that they did not call the Bishops' attention to certain strange slips as to S. Cyril and S. Athanasius, which are referred to in the notice of the *Prayer-Book Commentary* in our January number.

Mr. F. E. Warren's paper on the Communion Office received from the S.P.C.K. authorities), 'and we trusted that they would see their way to removing from it a grave and pernicious error respecting one of the Creeds. But in their lordships' judgment, apparently, the issue at stake is nothing more than a question of historical criticism, and so they dismiss the case without assenting to Professor Lumby's theory. The consequence is that the mischief which we hoped and tried to prevent must go on unchecked. The venerable, the safe and orthodox old Church Society is henceforth to tell Sunday school teachers and students in theology . . . that the Athanasian Creed is not older than the ninth century; and the hypothesis will find the more ready acceptance with these students and teachers as coming from what is commonly considered a reliable authority,' and as stated 'in a book which is sure to obtain a large circulation on account of its cheapness and the excellence and value of several of its articles—a book which would be really good but for the dead fly in the ointment,' &c. (p. 7). 'With the view of counteracting, as far as lies in me, the mischievous effects of this action of the venerable Society, I propose to show the falsity of the theory which it has taken under its patronage, and thus to substantiate the contention of my friends and myself in our memorial, that there is abundant evidence of the existence of the "Quicunque" . . . in its entirety, such as we now have it, at a date *prior* to the ninth century' (pp. 9, 13).

We commend the pamphlet in which this thesis is maintained to the attention of our readers, only remarking that the learned author, who has already published two volumes on the 'Quicunque,' traces its history up, in these pages, through several lines of documentary evidence, to the seventh century to which, he contends, evidence unknown to Waterland assigns the canon of Autun as to the recitation of 'the Faith of S. Athanasius.' In regard to the Commentary attributed to Venantius Fortunatus, he speaks rather less confidently in his *Early History of the Athanasian Creed*. There he says that 'it could not have been written later than the early part of' that 'seventh century' to the middle and to about the end of which he assigns those which he calls the 'Troyes' and the 'Oratorian.' Here he only says that it 'must have been written before the termination of the eighth century, and in all probability' was 'written considerably—it may be two centuries—before.' But here, as there, he cites the preface to the Oratorian Commentary, which not only speaks of the 'Quicunque' as 'everywhere recited in churches, and more frequently studied by presbyters than other *opuscula*,' but refers to certain 'old MSS.' as assigning it to 'the most blessed Athanasius.' In the *History* he argues that this reference takes us back, for the composition of the Creed, to the fifth century, and that probably it belongs to the first half of

tha
of S
write
prob
chap
part
sayin
at th
consi
learn
of th
extan
ancie
hund
centu
datin
begin
are g
assign
the co
argun
tiquit
cases
him,
as we
is so
positi
'Quic
Mr. C
in 187
the 'Q
Histo
gener
buted
our n
bution
ignore
Mr. C
excus
bridge
him a
by th

¹ If
1884, '
Creed,'

that century,¹ and to some period subsequent to the publication of S. Augustine's *De Trinitate*; and he suggests that the one writer of that epoch to whom it can 'with any degree of probability' be ascribed is Vincent of Lerins, the thirteenth chapter of whose *Commonitorium* reads like a fuller form of part of this Creed. Here, indeed, he contents himself with saying that, 'supposing we put' the Oratorian 'Commentary' at the very latest date at which it could have been composed, considering the date of the MSS. in which it is found, we learn, from these words of its author, that at the beginning of the tenth century ancient MSS. of the 'Quicunque' were extant, in which it was ascribed to S. Athanasius; and these ancient MSS. could not be conceived to be less than two hundred years old, or later than the first half of the eighth century.' He refers to his previously 'produced reasons for dating this Commentary at the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century;' and adds, 'If my reasons are good, then a proportionately higher antiquity must be assigned to those old copies of the Athanasian Creed of which the commentator speaks. But, for the purpose of my present argument, it is not necessary to insist upon this higher antiquity which I believe may be claimed for them.' In both cases he observes that the Oratorian commentator had before him, and transcribed, the whole of the Creed, verse by verse, as we have it, and that he therefore gives no support to, but is so far a witness against, the theory of 'two separate compositions' which were afterwards made to coalesce in the 'Quicunque.' The reader need not be reminded that it is to Mr. Ommanney's personal investigations at Troyes and Paris, in 1875, that we owe our knowledge of four commentaries on the 'Quicunque,' 'necessarily older,' as he says in his *Early History*, 'than any commentary described by Waterland and generally known, with the exception of that which is attributed to Venantius Fortunatus' (p. 1). It was observed in our number for January last that Dr. Lumby, in his contribution to the S.P.C.K. Prayer-Book Commentary, had simply ignored the evidence then 'recently brought to light' by Mr. Ommanney: a proceeding for which we can imagine no excuse, and which reflects discredit not only on the Cambridge professor, but on the S.P.C.K., which had adopted him as its representative on this subject. The course taken by the authorities of the Society in the two cases of Mr.

¹ If, as Dr. Hatch assumes in the *Contemporary Review* for June 1884, 'the definitions of Chalcedon furnished phrases for the Athanasian Creed,' why does not this Creed contain the 'In two Natures'?

Warren and of Dr. Lumby respectively is not likely to stimulate the loyalty, or to increase the confidence, of the Society's natural friends.

ART. VIII.—THE ORIGINS OF RELIGION AND LANGUAGE.

The Origins of Religion and Language. Considered in Five Essays. By F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, and Editor of the *Speaker's Commentary*. (London, 1884.)

SPECULATION about the beginnings of things is undoubtedly a popular line of thought. The men of the present evince a curiosity amounting almost to passion in this department of intellectual activity. And ever since the famous *Origin of Species* was launched upon a world which proved, after the first shock of surprise, not unprepared to receive it, an increasing proportion of the collective thought of mankind has run in the new channel, deepening and widening it until its capacity has come to seem adequate to the content of universal science. There is no denying an obvious fact. The terminology of Darwinism has been adopted in all departments of science and research; all who wish to gain a hearing, whether with specialists or with the ordinary cultivated class, must be familiar with its peculiar dialect, must be able to express what they have to say in the terms of Evolution. And in no sphere of research is this fashion of the time more obtrusively evident than in that which professes to deal with religion from the standpoint of positive science. The reason is obvious. For if it be the glory of Darwinism to have converted the barren instance of the old logical text books, 'Man is an animal,' into a truth vividly realized and vitally operative in unforeseen directions, the fact remains that he is a Religious Animal; and the specific difference thus asserted of him is unquestionably a characteristic as inconvenient for Evolutionary Materialists as it is abundantly apparent to simple observation. Here, in the heights and depths of man's moral and spiritual being, and not in that physical constitution which he shares with the creatures of the lower levels of existence, is the ultimate mystery, the problem of problems,

insoluble on merely materialistic grounds, which yet must be solved before it can be pretended that the origin of man has been brought out of the category of things not understood into the region of scientific commonplace. Not unnaturally, therefore, has it been the ambition of a host of recent 'Scientists' and Sciolists to demonstrate that religion, like every other human peculiarity, is the inevitable outcome of an undirected process of Evolution, to apply in this domain also the successful phrases 'Natural Selection,' 'Struggle for Existence,' 'Survival of the Fittest,' and the rest. Such efforts are commonly made under the mask of a wholly unbiassed and perfectly disinterested investigation of history. Sometimes the highest regard is professed for religion as existing in the civilized world. It is merely desired to penetrate the darkness of the past, and to reveal to the general perception things either misconceived or not apprehended at all. And all the while, as a recent writer of the opposite camp has noted, the whole course of the argument of these apparently unprejudiced inquirers involves one or other of two unacknowledged, perhaps unconscious, assumptions.

'One is the assumption that there is no God, and that it must have taken a long time to invent Him. The other is that there is a God, but that men were born or created or developed without any sense or feeling of His existence, and that the acquisition of such a sense must of necessity have been the work of time.'¹

Both of these assumptions fall to the ground the moment it is perceived that religion, as distinct from particular systems of religion, is an invariable characteristic of humanity, at whatever period and in whatever race or climate we consider it; and that the sense of Divine Existence, so far from being a comparatively modern faculty—a last result of intellectual development—is in fact a corollary and consequence of our mental constitution, a primary and universal feature of our common humanity. When, therefore, an illustrious philologist affirms,² 'Nihil in fide quod non ante fuerit in sensu,' we may still venture to reply, as Leibnitz did to the prototype of this affirmation, 'Nihil—nisi ipsa fides.'

The work before us is an important contribution towards the exposure of some of the fallacies prevalent in this field of thought. It contains so much that is of substantial value to the student of religion and the kindred subject of language, that it may seem ungrateful and captious to quarrel

¹ *The Unity of Nature*, by the Duke of Argyll, p. 450.

² *Lectures on the Origin of Religion*, by Max Müller, p. 224.

with its title, especially as the author has himself explained the circumstances owing to which his book has appeared under a designation which seems to promise more than the actual performance. We may, however, be allowed to confess to a passing sense of disappointment when, upon first inspection, we found that the 'Origins of Religion' meant chiefly the original form of Aryan religion, as exemplified in the hymns of the Rig Veda and the Gāthās of the Zendavesta. We missed a discussion of what appears to us an even more attractive and certainly not less important branch of the subject—the religious systems of the Hither East, of the Semitic races, of Babylon, Assyria, Canaan, and above all of Egypt, with which Canon Cook, notwithstanding his special knowledge, has only dealt incidentally and by way of passing reference. The Vedic and Zoroastrian systems are, indeed, distinguished at the outset as 'the oldest forms of religion of which we have contemporary or trustworthy records'; but, as the author apparently accepts Professor Monier Williams's estimate of the probable age of the oldest hymns of the Veda (circ. 1500 B.C.), and as he fixes the date of Zarathustra (Zoroaster), the supposed writer of the earliest Gāthās, in the age of Darius, the son of Hystaspes (Vistāspa),¹ we may well ask, Are not the most ancient documents of Egyptian belief older than either of the selected records, and may not a similar question be put respecting the fragmentary relics of the departed faiths of Accad and Sumír (Süngir—שִׁנְיָר, Shinar), Nineveh, and Babylon? If 'the oldest forms of religion of which we have contemporary or trustworthy records' are to be the objects of our investigation, it is surely natural to turn first to the monuments of Egypt and Babylonia. 'The oldest existing Sanskrit manuscripts were written only a few centuries ago. Some of our Egyptian papyri are not less than four thousand years old.' The *Book of the Dead*, chap. cxxv., 'contains the oldest known code of public and private morality. The fifteenth chapter, which is a hymn to the rising and to the setting sun, is the most ancient piece of poetry in the literature of the world.'² The literary remains of Sumero-Accadian antiquity which, in their Assyrian transcripts, have survived from the second and third millenniums before our era, consisting of magical formulæ and exorcisms (chiefly Sumerian), as also of Accadian hymns to the gods, including the very remarkable 'Buspsalmen,' or penitential psalms, which were perhaps produced under Semitic influence,

¹ See Sayce, *Herodotus*, App. V.

² *Hibbert Lectures*, by Le Page Renouf, pp. 169, 196.

dem
histor
the e
seen
to be
betwe
Christ
estima
to fix
B.C.
Sargá
of Na
that a
Midriv
gress
Dynas
sible r
and hi
French
estima
to tha
that of
Ca
secret.
his obj
of Ind
the cre
source
them
thesis
writers
in time
served
higher
degrad
when
worship
basis, t
physica
the for
fundam

¹ See
p. 486.
Sirburla
about 22

demand the serious consideration of all students of the early history of religion. Had Canon Cook found opportunity for the examination of this branch of the subject he might have seen reason to modify the statement (p. 19) that he is disposed to believe 'that the Rig Veda occupies a midway position between the first separation of the human race and the Christian era;' for this statement, taken along with his estimate of the probable age of the Veda (p. 16), would seem to fix the date of that primitive separation at about 3000 B.C. But Babylonian documents—such as the inscription of Sargâni, king of Agadê (Accad), who, according to a notice of Nabû-nâ'id (Nabonidus), flourished about 3800 B.C.¹—prove that already at that early period civilization was old in the Midriverland, not to speak of the thousands of years of progress implied by the Egyptian monuments of the Fourth Dynasty. There is now no longer any lack of materials, accessible not only to those who can handle the original cuneiform and hieroglyphic documents, but also to readers of English, French, and German, which would enable them to form some estimate of the progress of religion during ages far anterior to that of Vistâpa and his prophet, as here defined, or even that of Vasistha and his fellow singers.

Canon Cook writes with a purpose of which he makes no secret. On his first page he frankly and fearlessly avows that his object in devoting renewed study to the original documents of Indo-Aryan and Iranian religion has been to prove that the creeds which they embody 'were derived from a common source, and that all that is true, ennobling, and spiritual in them is due to that origin.' His theory is the exact antithesis of that which is presented to us by so many popular writers. He holds that the best in religion is also the first in time, and that the effect of religious development, as observed in history, has mostly been not gradual elevation to higher levels of belief and practice, but progressive decline, degradation, and decay. Thus he argues that 'at the period when the [Vedic] hymns were produced two systems [of worship] coexisted; the one resting upon a moral and spiritual basis, the other wholly naturalistic, personifying and adoring physical forces and agencies;' and that 'of these two systems the former was by far the more ancient, and represents the fundamental principles which were recognized by the ancestors

¹ See, however, Hommel, *Die Semitischen Völker und Sprachen*, p. 486. This Assyriologist fixes the age of the *Patesis* of Eridu and Sirburla between 3100 B.C. and 2900 B.C., and that of Sargon of Accad at about 2250 B.C.

of the Aryan race.' Again, in discussing the state of things that prevailed during the ages preceding the Aryan invasion of India, a conviction is expressed that 'on the one hand principles of paramount interest were the common possession of the whole race; and that, on the other hand, some very mischievous depravations and superstitions had already struck so deep root that they produced most deleterious results in all branches of the race, specially in India and Persia.' Proof of these positions is found in the comparative spirituality of the older conceptions of Deity, as exemplified in Dyaus, the Lord of Light, and the Ādityas, or Offspring of Āditi, the Infinite (*a* privative, and *diti* = *derós*, from *DĀ* = *δέω*), especially Varuna, the Protector, who corresponds with Ahura Mazda, the supreme god of Iranian religion; and stress is laid on the gradual displacement of this earlier and higher cultus in India by the worship of Indra and the Soma as a patent instance of development in a wrong direction. Not a single hymn of the Veda is addressed to Dyaus, and only nine are addressed to Varuna and five to the Ādityas, as against 217 to Indra and 192 to Agni (*ignis*, fire). The fact that the worship of Dyaus (*Zeús*, Jupiter) was supplanted in this manner by that of Indra (the Rainer; cf. Heb. *El Shaddai*) is also recognized by other scholars.

'We have seen,' writes Professor Max Müller, 'how the sky, originally the light-giver, the illuminator of the world, and for that reason called Dyaus . . . might be replaced by various gods, who represent some of the principal activities of the sky, such as thunder, rain, and storm' (Rudra, Indra, and the Maruts).¹

And the Professor insists that, whereas certain Vedic students have regarded Aditi as 'a goddess who came in at the very last moment of Vedic poetry,' because the concept of the Infinite seemed modern and because there are no hymns entirely addressed to her, she is, on the contrary, one of the most venerable names in the Veda. So also Dyaus 'is in fact one of the oldest Aryan deities, who at a later time was crowded out . . . by Indra, Rudra, Agni, and other purely Indian gods.'² But in the interpretation of these facts Canon Cook differs from Professor Max Müller and other authorities, as was only to be expected from the different principles assumed by each at starting. Max Müller lays down as a preliminary axiom, 'Nihil in fide quod non ante fuerit in sensu;' Canon Cook, on the other hand, believes in a primeval revela-

¹ *Lectures on the Origin of Religion*, p. 218.

² *Ibid.* p. 233 sq.

tion, h
purity
therefo
name
unkno
existen
that th
—a th
that A
ever vi
that s
seats s
one; f
than e
in the
further
unity
Aryan
unity
He ad
charac
by son
'Th
affected
Their l
agreein
distinct
religion
most r

Bu
argued
'those
the des
by the
and th
ant doc
the hu
the Ira

Th
Feridu
(It see
traditi
the te
18-27
of the
VOL

tion, handed down from age to age in varying degrees of purity among the different families of man. We are not therefore surprised when the latter scholar tells us that the name Aditi means 'the infinite, unconditioned, absolute, unknown Deity, recognized as the source and origin of all existence' (p. 41); while the former, agreeably with his theory that the ancient Aryans began with a kind of nature-worship—a theory which Canon Cook expressly denies—supposes that Aditi is 'one of the oldest names of the Dawn.' Whichever view be adopted, it can at all events hardly be questioned, that so long as the yet undivided race dwelt in its original seats somewhere N.W. of the Hindukush its religion also was one; for all history shows that unity of religion, even more than either blood or language, was the bond of national union in the antique world. But Canon Cook goes very much further than this, holding as he does not only the original unity of each of the great groups of nations which we call Aryan, Semitic, and Turanian respectively, but also the original unity of the human race and the original unity of its religion. He admits, indeed, without reserve all the striking differences characteristic of the Turanian families of mankind, and adduced by some anthropologists as proving diversity of origin.

'Their habits, domestic, social, and national, are wild, fierce, little affected by influences having a tendency towards any true civilization. Their languages, differing widely from each other in details, but agreeing in certain laws of structure, are one and all fundamentally distinct from those spoken by races of pure Aryan descent. Their religions or religious habits have invariably a weird, uncouth, and most repulsive character.'

But in spite of these seemingly radical differences it is argued that

'those Turanian families which came into closest contact with the descendants of Japhet [i.e. the Aryans] are distinctly recognized by them as their congeners, descendants from a common stock, and that not only in the Biblical record—the oldest and most important document which touches the affiliation of the several branches of the human family—but in the oldest and most certain traditions of the Iranians themselves.'

The reference is to the *Shahnámeh* of Firdausi, and Feridun's partition of the world between his three sons. (It seems doubtful, to say the least, whether any trustworthy tradition upon such a matter could have reached Firdausi in the tenth century A.D. And whether the account, Gen. ix. 18–27, ascribed by critics to the Ishwist or prophetic narrator of the Hexateuch, and the 'Völkertafel' of Gen. x., which

has at least been worked over by the same hand, and in short the demonstrably composite relations concerning Noah and his family, considered as a whole, may rightly be said to constitute the *oldest* document upon the subject, is a question which cannot be regarded as peremptorily settled by the traditional view.¹) Canon Cook even ventures to propound a theory of the causes which led to the original separation of the Turanians from their Aryan kinsfolk; this, however, with all due reserves, and in a manner far removed from dogmatic assertion in a subject confessedly involved in the utmost obscurity. That the pressure upon the means of subsistence occasioned by increase of population led to enforced migrations of just those portions of the community who were least qualified to resist expulsion, and that the emigrants would be accompanied in their wanderings by all who had any reason for discontent with the existing state of things—by young unruly spirits, debtors, persons of servile and semiservile status—is in itself a very plausible supposition, and one, moreover, which is confirmed by historic analogies. The Duke of Argyll has given a precisely similar account of the dispersion of primitive mankind.

'First,' he observes, 'it must be always the weaker men who are driven out from comfortable homes; and secondly, it must be always to comparatively unfavourable regions that they are compelled to fly. Under the operation of causes so combined as these, it would be strange indeed if the physical and mental condition of the tribes which have been exposed to them should remain unchanged.'²

Canon Cook supposes that the conspicuous inferiority of the Turanians is a degradation of type consequent upon the unfavourable climate and other conditions of their new life. Degeneracy would soon affect their language, which, to begin with, was hardly the pure speech of the ruling class (just as Sanskrit in the classical age was not spoken by servants or women); and the final result of an ever-increasing phonetic decay would be what are called monosyllabic and agglutina-

¹ As the names Shem, Ham, and Japhet may etymologically denote the brown, the black, and the white races, there is perhaps no reason why, if properly defined, they should not be used in ethnological discussion. With Shem cf. שֵׁם, onyx, the *pale* stone; Arab. سادم, altered (in complexion); Assyr. 𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶, *s'amû*, brownish. Ham is the Black or Swarthy, from חָמָם; cf. חֶמֶס, the sun. Japhet is the Fair, from יָפֶת; cf. Assyr. 𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶, *ippû*, fem. *ippatû*.

² *Unity of Nature*, p. 424. Cf. also Maine's *Early History of Institutions*, pp. 167 sqq.

tive
conje
do no
Arya
emph
Semi

T
tion o
of A
opini
debas
super
histor
may l
the so
the p
was s
abuse
Sham
frenzy
The f
must

'the w
the pl
liquor

W
which
that, u
world,
fact, il
with
steadi
their f
the da
system
ceded
hymns
the lat
porten
faith o
we ma
sand y

¹ F
Philolo

tive forms of speech.¹ This is, of course, no more than a conjecture; nor is it proposed as more. Ordinary philologists do not venture to go behind the ultimate division of Semitic, Aryan, and Turanian families of language, the last term being employed, vaguely enough, to include whatever is neither Semitic nor Aryan in form and structure.

The question next considered is, Can we, on the supposition of unity of origin, account for the fundamental differences of Aryan and Turanian religion? and Canon Cook is of opinion that we can. He traces the magical rites and other debased characteristics of Shamanism to 'two radically evil superstitions prevalent at the very earliest period in the history of the Aryan races,' viz. fire worship, which he thinks may have been the very earliest form of idolatry, and that of the soma juice, used by both Indo-Aryans and Iranians for the purpose of inducing an exaltation or intoxication which was strangely believed to be a state of inspiration. To this abuse the author affiliates the like method by which the Shamans are in the habit of working themselves up into frenzy before uttering their spells, prayers, or prophecies. The force of this comparison is not diminished by what we must regard as the very doubtful supposition that

'the whole system originated in legendary and corrupt traditions of the planting of the vine and the accidental discovery of alcoholic liquor by Noah.'

Whatever may be thought of this and other suggestions, which are really incapable of verification, it is quite certain that, upon examination of the great historical religions of the world, one fact emerges which cannot be gainsaid. It is the fact, illustrated by most writers conversant, like Canon Cook, with the original documents, that all these systems have steadily declined from the comparative loftiness and purity of their first beginnings. Buddhism is not now what it was in the days of Gautama, its founder; Brahmanism, of which the system of the Sâkyamuni was avowedly a reform, had receded far from the doctrine and practice implied by the Vedic hymns when the Buddha began his work of regeneration; the later system of the Magi and Parsism developed into a portentous aggregation of hurtful superstitions from the simple faith of Zoroaster. And, to go further back into antiquity, we may doubt whether the primitive Aryans who 'five thousand years ago, or it may be earlier, speaking as yet neither

¹ For a very different view see Sayce's *Principles of Comparative Philology*, 'The Idolum of Common Centres of Language.'

Sanskrit, Greek, nor Latin,' addressed 'the All-Father' as *Dyu Patar*, Heaven Father,' were really worshippers of the powers and forces of external nature. Arguing, as man must always have done since he was man, from the great facts of his own consciousness and experience, they ascribed to the Divine Being, whose existence was and is a fact of primary perception, a Personality like their own; and they expressed His creative functions under the simple and natural figure of fatherhood. It is not difficult to understand how the personification of the attributes of Deity might in course of time degenerate into polytheism. There is abundant evidence that such was actually the case in Aryan religion, and this evidence is borne out by the history of Semitic cultus. Whether we turn to Professor Max Müller or to Mr. Le Page Renouf, we shall find sufficient indications of the evolution of decay in ancient systems of religion.

'It is incontestably true,' remarks the latter writer, 'that the sublimer portions of the Egyptian religion are not the comparatively late result of a process of development or elimination from the grosser. The sublimer portions are demonstrably ancient; and the last stage of the Egyptian religion, that known to the Greek and Latin writers, heathen or Christian, was by far the grossest and most corrupt.'²

Christianity itself is no exception to the law of decline; but, at the same time, it would appear to be the only historical religion which contains within itself any vital power of recuperation, of revival and rejuvenescence from periods of decadence and decay—a secret and inexhaustible spring of self-renewal and reform.

The essay on the Persian cuneiform inscriptions and the *Zendavesta* is an important one, and gives proof everywhere of the immense application and high linguistic ability with which the author has devoted his leisure for many years to the interpretation of the Zoroastrian texts, one of the most obscure and difficult of philological problems. The student of religion would have much reason to be grateful if the author had published no more than this one essay, with its valuable appendix giving a translation of the *Ahunavaiti*, the first and most important of the *Gâthâs*. It is doubtless a mere slip when it is stated (p. 109) that all branches of the Semitic race adopted from the outset the process of writing from right to left, as this was not the case with the Assyrian and Babylonian

¹ Max Müller, *Lectures on the Origin of Religion*, p. 223; and *Introduction to the Science of Religion*, p. 173.

² *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 91.

cuneiform
separat
(pp. 111
I am a
Achæm
Cook a
Babylon
inscript
on the
have m
of Baby
pure m
superst
Persian
the sam
conquer
reverent
Moreov
and rep
We can
more th
the Ro
that he

In t
religion
ginal si
tions, C
mainly
not me
Gâthâs
tures—
enemy
dâd are
essay (I
commo
in the
Here a
regards
Satan,
the form
Ormuzd
say tha

¹ See
1880; N

cuneiform writing, nor with the far later Ethiopic. The separation of words by means of an oblique wedge is stated (pp. 110, 133) to be found 'with but one exception, so far as I am aware, that of the famous Moabite Stone,' only in the Achæmenid inscriptions and in the Zendavesta. Canon Cook appears to have forgotten for the moment the Assyro-Babylonian use of the double wedge, the point of the Siloam inscription (circ. 700 B.C.), and the line which separates words on the Himyaritic monuments. Recent discoveries, again, have made it more than doubtful that Cyrus, the conqueror of Babylon and liberator of the Jewish exiles, 'maintained a pure monotheism uncontaminated by Scythian or fanatical superstitions' (p. 124); and that 'when the Hebrews and Persians first came into contact they felt that they worshipped the same god' (pp. 63, 142). In the cuneiform records of his conquest of Babylon Cyrus is represented as paying sedulous reverence to the Babylonian deities Bel-Merodach and Nebo. Moreover in the Bible itself (Isa. xlv. 5, 6) it is expressly said and repeated of Cyrus, 'Thou hast not known me' (*i.e.* Jahweh). We can hardly ascribe to the all-conquering ruler of Anzan more than a kind of politic syncretism such as distinguished the Roman Empire in a later age, and it is highly probable that he was himself a genuine polytheist.¹

In the course of a deeply interesting discussion of Persian religion as it developed, or rather degenerated, from the original simplicity and purity exhibited in the Achæmenid inscriptions, Canon Cook emphasizes the fact that Ahriman (Angromainyus) and his host of evil spirits, the devas or drugs, are not mentioned at all in those inscriptions, and that in the Gâthâs—that is, the oldest portion of the Zoroastrian Scriptures—there are at most one or two allusions to the great enemy of Ormuzd. The terrible superstitions of the Vendidad are clearly an aftergrowth. A considerable part of the essay (pp. 165–201) is devoted to a discussion of the features common to Zoroastrianism and Hebrew and Christian belief, in the course of which the question of priority is argued. Here again there is much room for difference of opinion. As regards the connexion between Ahriman and the Biblical Satan, it is unquestionably a salient point of disagreement if the former is conceived as an eternal being 'coetaneous with Ormuzd.' On the other hand, it savours of exaggeration to say that 'Satan's malignity was recognized in Hebrew records

¹ See *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, March 2, 1880; Nov. 7, 1882. Sayce, *Herodotus*, Appendix V., p. 439.

written ages before the Hebrews came into contact with the Persians, and that 'the Satan of the Old Testament is from first to last exactly what he is described in the New.' A little after 'the Satan of Job and of the prophets' is mentioned (p. 169); but Zech. iii. 1, 2 is the solitary prophetic passage (and that belonging to the Persian period) where Satan is mentioned at all. And not only so, but the term Satan occurs only ten times in the Old Testament, exclusive of the prologue of Job and Zech. *l. c.*; and in eight of these it denotes, not *the* Satan or Accusing Spirit, but either a human or a celestial opponent (*e.g.* 1 Kings xi. 14; cf. Matt. xvi. 23; Num. xxii. 22, 32). In fact, besides the prologue of Job (ch. i. ii.), and Zech. iii. 1, 2, the only passages which may be supposed to foreshadow the Satan of later Jewish belief are Ps. cix. 6, where the language coincides with Zech. iii. 1, and 1 Chron. xxi. 1; but the context suggests an earthly accuser. In Job and Zechariah the term has the definite article, שָׂטָן, ὁ Σατανᾶς, thus marking him out as the adversary, κατ' ἐξοχήν; in the other passages it is not so. In 1 Chron. xxi. 1 the word seems to be used strictly as a proper name, but the passage is irrelevant, as belonging to the Grecian period. It comes to this, then: that the cardinal passages of the Old Testament which speak of an evil spirit under the name of the Satan are the prologue of Job and Zech. iii. 1, 2; and if, as appears most probable, the great poem of Job must be assigned to the latest pre-exilic time, we see at once the precariousness of the assertion that the conception of Satan, so far as it is actually found in the Old Testament Scriptures, was not influenced by Persian belief. At all events, in the presence of this paucity of references it must be admitted that the words we have italicized might convey false impressions to readers unacquainted with the statistics of the case.

Canon Cook insists further on the differences between the idea of hell in the Avesta and that derived from the Christian Scriptures; as also between the Amshasponds, or Amesha-spentas, and the Izeds, or Yazatas, and the Hebrew conception of angels and archangels. But the essential idea of hell as 'the house of woe and pain' reserved for the wicked hereafter is surely expressed in the verse of the 5th chant, thus rendered by Canon Cook:—

'He who deceives the righteous
Will dwell for evermore in darkness;
For food will have but poison,
With weeping and voices of wailing.

And as
of being
extent o
might s
of devel
the gen
the app
archang
unnatur
influen
gelology
similarit
beliefs—
the serps
view, ad
resembl
tion of
ing from
similarit
evidenc
municat
lost in t
which to
transcen
We can
'the ne
various
finds mo
accounts
195) as i
cussion
or legen
It may
point to
the unit
the exis
that we l
was. T
a dream

¹ See
author's *A
logie und
in Kuene*

To that world, ye evildoers,
Works done by your law will conduct you.'

And as to the second point, the Persian and the Hebrew order of beings might very well not be identical 'either in name, or extent of power, or in supposed functions; the two systems might spring from different sources, and follow different lines of development' (p. 181), and yet with all special differences the generic resemblances might be great enough to justify the application to both of such vague terms as angels and archangels; and this application can hardly be considered unnatural when we remember that Babylonian and Persian influences are indisputably evident in the later Jewish angelology and demonology.¹ In these as in other points of similarity between Biblical and non-Biblical traditions and beliefs—e.g. about the original condition of man, Paradise and the serpent, the Flood, &c.—we cannot, for our part, accept the view, advocated with so much learning in these pages, that the resemblances in question are only explicable on the assumption of true historical reminiscence, or else of direct borrowing from the Old Testament Scriptures; nor can we regard similarity of beliefs among widely separated nations as certain evidence of a primeval body of truths supernaturally communicated to the first men, and never wholly corrupted or lost in the course of transmission through a series of ages which to us, though apparently not to the author, appears to transcend by millenniums the period of six thousand years. We cannot help thinking that the author's warning as to 'the necessity of extreme caution in using documents of various ages, produced under different circumstances' (p. 196), finds most appropriate application in dealing with those very accounts in the book of Genesis to which allusion is made (p. 195) as in their totality certainly primeval, and that without discussion of their relation to the Babylonian cycle of tradition or legend, with which they present so many points of contact. It may be that the general tendency of modern research is to point to the original unity of the race, and consequently to the unity of its religion. This would, of course, imply also the existence of one original language. But it cannot be said that we have any the remotest conception of what that language was. That it was Hebrew or anything resembling Hebrew is a dream of the unphilological past. The Biblical Hebrew is

¹ See Liber Henoch Aethiopice, cura Aug. Dillmann; and the same author's *Das Buch Henoch*. Also A. Kohut, *über die jüdische Angelologie und Dämonologie*, etc.; and the chapter on Judaism and Parseism in Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, vol. iii.

in many respects a comparatively modern idiom, agreeing with the spoken Arabic of to-day rather than with the classical Arabic of the Qur'ān in such important matters as the rejection of case endings. In this and other respects the Assyrian of the monuments is in a much better state of phonetic preservation.

Canon Cook's theory of the Egyptian language differs considerably from that entertained by other Egyptologists. He holds that the people were closely connected with the negroes, and that an enormous quantity of roots is common to the chief Nigritian languages and to old Egyptian. In the last part of the work about 250 Egyptian words are compared with supposed cognates in Semitic Aryan and Anaryan languages, and a conviction is avowed that very few of the Egyptian words contained in the vocabularies of Birch, Brugsch, and Pierret would prove incapable of similar identification. This might very well be the case, without necessitating the conclusion of real identity. Accidental coincidences of sound and sense are too common in language to excite any surprise; and in the matter of comparing an isolating tongue like Egyptian with inflexional languages of the Aryan and Semitic families we have, alas! no Grimm's law to guide us. This alone would constitute an insuperable obstacle to any really scientific inferences from this diversified comparison of Egyptian vocables with those belonging to remote and, so far as can be shown, unrelated languages. The modern Coptic is, in fact, the only certain cognate, as it is the solitary offshoot, of the ancient Egyptian.

'A certain number of Egyptian words,' writes Mr. Le Page Renouf, one of the greatest of living Egyptologists, 'such as *i*, "go," *tā*, "give, place," have the same meaning as the corresponding Indo-European roots. And a few other Egyptian words seem very like Semitic words of the same meaning. But the total number of words in the Egyptian vocabulary which have the appearance of relationship either with the Aryan or with the Semitic stock turns out, after passing through the necessary process of sifting, to be extremely small. A considerable number of words have certainly passed from one language into another, but all these have to be deducted. Those who talk of Egyptian having its root in Semitic, or say that its grammar is Semitic, must mean something quite different from what these words imply in the mouth of some one well versed in the science of language.'

Canon Cook has not indeed said exactly this; for his theory is that Egyptian represents an earlier stage of the Semitic, and 'comes nearest to the language spoken after the

separa
scenda
this be
as eve
Hebre
the m
we wit
transf
strike
the ro
tinativ
other s
flexion
identifi

In
itself a
parison
'man,'
Persian
adama
ground
cases a
derived
crept in
is conn
more p
I-HI-V
complete

'I ha
borrowe
ehyeh fro
of the 2
once th
Divine M
who kno
Osiris."

It is mo

'I ha
Egyptian
anything
doubt be
of ideas

¹ See

p. 244 sq.

² Max

³ Hibi

separation from the Aryan or Japhetic groups by the descendants of Shem and Ham.' But then, it may be asked, if this be so, if centuries of wear and tear divide such languages as even the ancient Assyro-Babylonian, and much more the Hebrew, from that stage of speech of which the Egyptian of the monuments is so strange a survival or petrification, how can we with any confidence compare the last results of phonetic transformation in Assyrian or Hebrew with words which strike us as similar in the elder tongue? Egyptian is still in the root stage of language, and is only imperfectly agglutinative, *e.g.* in the case of the pronominal and one or two other suffixes,¹ whereas the Semitic languages are highly inflexional. An impassable gulf divides the objects of attempted identification.

In glancing through the Collection of Words, which is itself a monument of labour, we have noticed one or two comparisons which at once strike the mind as improbable. אָדָם, 'man,' for instance, is connected with Egyptian *tam*, old Persian *adam*, I, instead of Accadian *adama* and Assyrian *adamatu*, the red race, and its immediate cognates, אֶרֶץ, 'the ground' (the red earth), אֶדֶם, *red*, and אֶדוֹם, Edom. In some cases also, as might be expected in such a mass of details derived from so many sources, demonstrable errors have crept in—*e.g.* (p. 405) where 'nok pu nok' of the *Todtenbuch* is connected with the Mosaic 'I am that I am,' which, though more plausible than Rémusat's identification of the Chinese I-HI-WEI² with JE-HO-VAH, has been shown to be a complete mistake.

'I have repeatedly seen it asserted,' says Mr. Renouf, 'that Moses borrowed his concept of God and the sublime words *chyeh asher chyeh* from the Egyptian *nuk pu nuk*. Now if we look at the passages of the *Book of the Dead* where these words occur, we shall see at once that they do not contain any mysterious doctrine about the Divine Nature. In one of these passages the deceased says, "It is I who know the ways of Nu." In another place, ". . . It is I who am Osiris."'

It is most instructive to observe that Mr. Renouf adds—

'I have thought through a number of works professing to discover Egyptian influences in Hebrew institutions, but have not even found anything worth controverting. Purely external resemblances may no doubt be discovered in abundance, but evidence of the transmission of ideas will be sought in vain.'³

¹ See Le Page Renouf's *Egyptian Grammar*, and his *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 244 sq.

² Max Müller, *Introd. to Science of Religion*, p. 332.

³ *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 55 sq.

To sum up: We have in the work before us (1) a careful and elaborate discussion of the religious and linguistic phenomena presented by the original documents of the Indo-Aryans and Iranians, illustrated by scholarly translations of texts; (2) a popular sketch of most of the languages about which anything is known (this essay, though readable enough, might very well have been omitted, as being somewhat below the standard of those which precede it, and occasionally presenting statements either erroneous or not generally accepted by philologists); (3) an interesting compilation of words belonging to different families of speech, derived from numerous sources and designed with much ingenuity to prove the original unity of language. If we are not able, for reasons assigned, to accept Canon Cook's evidence precisely in the light that he intends, we still welcome his book as really and essentially confirming that which he seeks to establish. His object has been

'to adduce evidence sufficient to illustrate the fundamental principles on which all religion and all morality rest—belief in the unity of faith founded upon a Divine revelation, and the unity of the race, of which the universal and true characteristic is the capacity of apprehending and adoring the Creator' (p. 364).

It can hardly be disproven that those higher apprehensions of the Divine, which the author has so well traced in the Veda and the Zendavesta, and which may be compared with those which find expression in the Egyptian hymns¹ and the Accadian penitential psalms and litanies, have their deep foundation on the one hand in the constitution of the human mind, which is essentially identical under all varieties of circumstance, and on the other hand in the eternal unity of the Divine Being. In all ages and countries the mind of man has recognized—surely by 'Divine revelation'—that is, by the immediate self-manifestation of God—the real existence of a Personal Being, having authority over itself and all things else. This perception of the Divine is as direct and simple in the region of the spirit as is the perception of external objects in the region of the senses; and no amount of argument can add to its clearness and certainty. It is a matter demanding but moderate ingenuity to compact a mosaic of half-forgotten customs, half-intelligible popular sayings, vanishing beliefs, savage myths, barbarous practices, and to present this thing of shreds and patches as a scientific resuscitation of the religious and moral life of the unknown past. It is tempting

¹ See Renouf, Lecture VI.

to assu
in the
the la
laws a
if only
savage
But th
that in
proces
savage
the la
The t
or nat
ceded
which
early
was no
much
above
out of
early
was th
of Ca
Indo-A
that of
and th
plified
names
prayer
Babyle
conclu
used b
which
preter.

'Be
[and all
the Pow
univers
whom h
Holy an
ence th
of an af
Indo-Ar

to assume that there is a kind of stratified order in religions as in the rocks which form the crust of the earth, and to find the last explanation of the phenomena of the spirit in the laws and terminology of pure physics. Tempting also it is, if only because so easy, to regard the contemporary life of savagery as a kind of survival of man's primeval condition. But this hypothesis is negatived by the obvious consideration that if the civilized man is a last product of a prolonged process of natural evolution, so also is the contemporary savage. The former, in fact, has at least as much right as the latter to be taken for the original type of the species. The theory also that totemism, or fetishism, or Shamanism, or nature-worship, or polytheism, must invariably have preceded monotheism is no more than an unproven assumption, which is certainly not borne out by an examination of the early history of known religions. The worship of the Veda was not a mere worship of the powers of nature, however much in later times it may have degraded in that direction;¹ above all, the Semites did not gradually evolve monotheism out of a primitive polytheism. Rather their religion was early corrupted by contact with Accadian superstitions, as was that of Israel in the after time by contact with the cultus of Canaan. Whether we look at the oldest expression of Indo-Aryan faith as embodied in the Vedic hymns, or at that of the Iranians as illustrated by the inscriptions of Darius and the Gâthâs of Zoroaster, or at that of Egypt as exemplified in the hymns to those gods 'who were in fact but names of the One who resided in them all,' or at the oldest prayers and psalms of the Semitic and pre-Semitic peoples of Babylonia, we seem to be led to a single and inevitable conclusion. That conclusion may be stated in the words used by Mr. Renouf of that old Egyptian system of belief which has found in him so able and so eloquent an interpreter.

'Besides the powers recognized by the mythology, the Egyptian [and all other leading races of antiquity] from the very first spoke of the Power by whom the whole physical and moral government of the universe is directed, upon whom each individual depends and to whom he is responsible. A sense of the Eternal and Infinite, the Holy and Good [Being] governing the world, and of man's dependence thereon; a sense of right and wrong, of holiness and virtue, of an after-life and retribution—such are the main elements, alike of Indo-Aryan, of Iranian, of Babylonian, and of Egyptian religion.'²

¹ Max Müller, *Lect. Sc. Rel.* p. 172.

² Le Page Renouf, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 251 sq.

As mythology induced decay, these truer perceptions of the unity of God and all that is thereby involved were not immediately obliterated; and the so-called *henotheism* of the Veda and the Egyptian cultus was but an unconscious expedient for securing their preservation. This partially explains what must at one time or another have excited the wonder of most of us, the perpetual reference to *ὁ θεός* in the writings of the illustrious Greeks, combined with an apparently incompatible acquiescence in or toleration of the popular polytheism.

If it be asked what preceded these early forms of faith, so full of sublime perceptions, yet already containing in themselves the germs of inevitable decline, we cannot return any answer more direct or positive than this: Unless we choose to assume that the early chapters of Genesis are to be understood as constituting a literal and precise history of primeval man, in the sense that Dr. Stubbs's *Constitutional History of England* is a literal and precise history of the origin and growth of the English political system, we cannot say for certain that monotheism in our sense of the word was the one primeval faith. But we can say what seems to be enough for the believer in the great principles of all religion. We can say that the human mind was there, endowed with the same faculties of perceiving things human and Divine as now; differentiated from all other sentient inhabitants of earth by its instinctive habit of looking heavenwards, and apprehending under and behind all phenomena the being and working of a sovereign Personal Power accessible to prayer and not indifferent to the welfare of His creatures. We can say that the unity of the phenomenal world, but especially the unity of the self-conscious mind, must always have exerted a strong influence in favour of the recognition of the unity of the Creator. In this sense also 'the word was very nigh to man, in his mouth and in his heart:' its apprehension did not depend upon long and intricate processes of philosophic thought; the assertion of it was a simple and natural exercise of his faculty of speech, the perception of it was the natural function of his organ of spiritual insight. In short, independently of what criticism may decide or has decided about the origin and import of the fragmentary narratives of Genesis, the original unity of man and the consequent original unity of his language and his religion must remain the only hypothesis which recommends itself to calm reason, even as it is the only hypothesis which thoroughly harmonizes with the tendency of all science to seek the One in the many, to reduce the manifold to Unity.

AR

1. Rep
P

M

2. The

3. Pap

Jo

(N

4. Rev

W

HAVIN

Eucha

to tho

They a

We

a whol

affirmi

and th

Holy C

either

Litany

and giv

'On

said, or

Service,

as he s

direction

We su

service

select;

may in

Comm

course

inserted

and, fo

also.

1 p

ART. IX.—PRAYER-BOOK ENRICHMENT IN AMERICA.

SECOND NOTICE.¹

1. *Report of the Joint Committee on the Book of Common Prayer, appointed by the General Convention of MDCCCLXXX.* (Philadelphia, 1883.)
2. *The Book annexed to the Report.* (Philadelphia, 1883.)
3. *Papers on Liturgical Enrichment.* By the Right Reverend JOHN FREEMAN YOUNG, S.T.D., Bishop of Florida. (New York, 1883.)
4. *Revision of the American Common Prayer.* By the Rev. WILLIAM REED HUNTINGTON. (New York, 1883.)

HAVING pointed out the proposed improvements in the Eucharistic office, which claimed our first attention, we pass to those which affect the Daily and Occasional Services. They are numerous and highly important.

We observe, first, in the preliminary General Rubrics, a wholly new one 'Concerning the Service of the Church,' affirming that 'the Order for Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion, are independent Services, and may be used either separately or together;' authorizing the use of the Litany after the third Collect, either morning or evening; and giving the following highly important permission, that—

'On any day when Morning and Evening Prayer shall have been said, or are to be said in Church, the Minister may, at any other Service, with or without a Sermon or Lecture, use such devotions as he shall at his discretion select from this Book, subject to the direction of the Ordinary.'

We suppose that by the 'other service' is intended some service consisting of such devotions as the minister shall select; and that the liberty here given does not mean that he may insert Prayer-Book devotions *ad libitum* in, e.g., the Communion Office, and that anywhere, before, after, or in the course of it. Occasional prayers might well, indeed, be inserted before the Prayer of S. Chrysostom in the Litany; and, for the matter of that, in other Prayer-Book services also. But such a permission, if it is intended to be given,

¹ For the First Notice, see Art. IX. No. XXXV., April, 1884.

should be more clearly expressed in the new Rubric prefixed to the Occasional Prayers. Perhaps in the Rubric before us, 'at other times,' or 'at other hours,' would be less ambiguous than 'at any other service.'

Proper Psalms are added for the first Sunday in Advent, Circumcision, Epiphany, Transfiguration, Purification, Annunciation, Easter Even, Trinity Sunday, Michaelmas Day, and All Saints' Day. The Table of Selections of Psalms to be used optionally instead of the Psalms for the day is entirely re-cast, giving twenty Selections instead of the ten of the Standard Book. Might we plead for a twenty-first Selection, to consist of the four ancient Compline Psalms, iv. xxx. 1-6, xci., and cxxxiv., for use at a late evening service, as the twentieth Selection gives us the three last Psalms of Lauds?

We next approach the great subject of the Lectionary. This has evidently been very fully and carefully dealt with; and, after our own not wholly satisfactory experience of a new Lectionary—an experience which, it is clear, has not been lost upon our Transatlantic brethren—is of the highest practical interest to us in England. We note, first, the General Rubrics, that 'If in any church, upon a Sunday or Holy-day, both Morning and Evening Prayer¹ be not said, the Minister may read the Lessons appointed either for Morning or for Evening Prayer.'

'At Evening Prayer on Sunday, the Minister may read the Lesson from the Gospels appointed for that day of the month, in place of the Second Lesson for the Sunday.' The American Church has always had proper Second Lessons as well as First Lessons for every Sunday and Holy-day. Its Sunday First Lessons are very different from ours, except in the Reading of Isaiah from Advent to Epiphany VI. The chief differences in respect of the Sunday Lectionary between the present Standard Book and the *Book Annexed* are (1) That the latter gives Revelation i., ii., iii., and xxii. for the four Sunday evenings in Advent; and (2) shortens, in many cases, the Lessons of the Standard Book; instead of whole chapters, giving only portions of the same chapters.

The Table of Lessons for Holy-days has received very careful revision, and now differs greatly from that in the Standard Book, and from our own. Then we observe an entirely new feature in 'A Table of Lessons for the Forty Days of Lent, and for the Rogation and Ember Days'—[it

¹ We may remark, in passing, that 'Matins' and 'Evensong' have never existed, from the first, in the American Church.

should
Days'
Calen
think,
ception
nature
(to qu
'verita
presen
own o
first L
to Ma
Lesson
certain
It read
Second
Evenin
The B
our ne
improv
chapter
fuller s
and C
of chap
unacco
the inc
Apocry
Pas
ing Pra
mitting
Easter
Day,' to
prayer
abstine
days o
cretion,
reserva
Exhort
the Cor
True, th
then P
Absolu
our Ma
of their
them.

should run, surely, 'and for the Rogation Days and the Ember Days']—'which may be used in place of those appointed in the Calendar.' This system is, on the whole, we are disposed to think, of doubtful advantage, at least for Lent, with the exception, of course, of Holy Week. But in all matters of this nature, use and experience is the only satisfactory test; and (to quote the coin-motto of poor Queen Mary of England) '*veritas filia temporis*.' In the ordinary Calendar Lessons the present Standard Book follows the same general lines as our own old Lectionary. It appoints the Old Testament for the first Lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer, from Genesis to Malachi, closing the year with Isaiah; but without any Lessons from the Apocrypha, an omission which involves a certain amount of splitting of chapters, to cover the time. It reads the Gospels and Acts twice each year at Morning Second Lessons and the Epistles three times each year in Evening Second Lessons, omitting the Revelation altogether. The *Book Annexed* in this matter follows the general lines of our new Lectionary, its variations from which are probably improvements on ours; such, *e.g.* as rather less splitting of chapters throughout, indeed almost none in the Epistles; a fuller selection of historically consecutive chapters from Kings and Chronicles; and the inclusion, at the close of the year, of chapters ix., xiii., and xvii., of the Revelation, which we so unaccountably omit. It improves on the Standard Book in the inclusion, in November, of thirty-eight Lessons from the Apocrypha.

Passing now to the Orders for Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, we notice, first, the new introductory rubric permitting the minister at Morning Prayer '*on Christmas Day, Easter Day, and Whit Sunday, and on any day not a Lord's Day*,' to '*omit the Exhortation, and proceed to bid the People to prayer at the Confession, or, except on days of fasting and abstinence, at the Lord's Prayer*'; and at Evening Prayer, '*on days other than the Lord's Day*,' to '*pass at once, at his discretion, from the Sentences to the Lord's Prayer*,' without any reservation of 'fasting-days.' The occasional omission of the Exhortation is welcome enough. The possible omission of the Confession and Absolution is very seriously questionable. True, the ancient services began with the Lord's Prayer; but then Prime and Compline always included Confession and Absolution. Surely they give a large part of their value to our Matins and Evensong, and form a considerable portion of their attraction to the devout souls who love and frequent them. The plea against length is absurd in this connexion,

any regard being had to the importance of these elements of worship.

Three additional Sentences (Hab. ii. 20, Mal. i. 11, Ps. xix. 14, 15) had already, in the Standard Book, been prefixed to our own. To the Morning Office, the *Book Annexed* further adds Ps. cxxii. 1, Phil. i. 2, Isa. xi. 3, for Advent; S. Luke ii. 10, 11, for Christmas Day; Isa. lii. 1, for Epiphany; with Mal. i. 11, Lam. i. 12, for Good Friday; S. Mark, xvi. 6, S. Luke xxiv. 34, and Ps. cxviii. 24, for Easter Day; S. John iv. 23, for Whit-Sunday; and Rev. iv. 8, for Trinity Sunday.

The Evening Sentences, as proposed, are wholly different from those prefixed to Morning Prayer, thus offering a very acceptable variety. They run as follows:—Ps. xxvi. 8; Ps. cxli. 2; Ps. xcvi. 9; then, after a break, five removed from the present Morning Office, viz. Ps. li. 17; Ps. li. 3, 9; Joel, ii. 13; Jer. x. 24; and 1 John i. 8, 9. These eight are for ordinary use. Then, for Seasons: Advent, S. Mark xiii. 35, 36; Christmas Day, Rev. xxi. 3; Epiphany, Isai. ii. 5, 3; Easter Day, Col. iii. 1; Whit-Sunday, Rev. xxii. 17, Ps. xliii. 3; Trinity Sunday, Isai. vi. 3. This provision of Special Sentences for the Seasons is a great gain; and might further include with advantage Proper Sentences for the Annunciation and the Ascension, and a general one for all Festivals of Apostles. There is a manifest practical advantage in striking at once, and clearly, the keynote of the Service that is to follow.

At this point it is necessary to remind our English readers of the greatness and difficulty of the task entrusted to the Joint-Committee, as measured by the unhappy amount of deterioration to which—so unlike their upward move, at the same epoch, in the matter of their Communion Office—this portion of the Prayer-Book underwent in America a century ago. We do so in no spirit of blame, except of ourselves. For it was surely the apathy and neglect of the Church at home which, coupled with some political difficulties, account for the low state to which average American churchmanship had sunk a century ago. We may regret, but we cannot be surprised at, the effects of this in the lowering of the Prayer-Book Services as offered to and used by the general body of those who still adhered to our Communion. Our space forbids a complete enumeration of the changes made, every one of them for the worse. We can only name the more important. Of the excision of the Athanasian Creed, and the failure to seize the present opportunity to restore it, we spoke in a brief 'Notice' of the *Book Annexed* in our January number. We note now,

verse
O L
Anne
2
unles
gestic
Excel
Even

3.

after
same,
Churc
our s
want
Praye
portion
it in t

TH
perfect
perfect
develo
accom
the L
of prai
the Ca
And th
ture ha
Reform
Divine
begins
sions o
might
of unb
began,
and no
trespass
ledgme
Confess
and Re
was tha
children
course
sponds
itself.

VOL.

1. The loss at Matins and Evensong of the old opening verse and response at all the hours, 'O God, make speed; O Lord, make haste,' &c. These are not restored in the *Book Annexed*.

2. The optional omission of the *Gloria* after the Psalms, unless after the last; and, after the last, the absurd suggestion of an optional use, instead of it, of the *Gloria in Excelsis*, a permission which the *Book Annexed* retains at Evensong.

3. The most lamentable omission of the *Kyrie* and *Pater* after the Creed. Compare the suggested omission of the same, and of much that follows them, in the Litany and the Churching of Women. We must be pardoned if we express our surprise at the extraordinary liturgical ignorance and want of perception which dictated the excision of the Lord's Prayer from its place of honour at the opening of the Prayer-portion of Matins and Evensong, and at the failure to restore it in the *Book Annexed*.

The Lord's Prayer is not only in itself the best, the most perfect, and the most all-inclusive, of prayers; it is also the perfect model of all prayer and worship, even in their most developed forms. As from the Words of Institution and their accompanying Acts has grown the Christian Liturgy, so from the Lord's Prayer, with the help of that inspired repertory of praise and prayer, the Psalter, has grown by development the Catholic Church's system of daily non-eucharistic worship. And the order and arrangement of its fully developed structure has followed the lines of the Divine model. The later Reformed Church indeed, in her Daily Service, comes into the Divine Presence laden with the sense of still oppressive sin, begins with confession, and insists each day afresh on expressions of repentance and of resolution of amendment which might befit even such as were turning to God after years of unbroken indifference and neglect. The ancient services began, as does the Lord's Prayer, with the thought of God, and not of self; of His glory, His goodness, not of man's trespasses and sins. The necessary and inevitable acknowledgment of these came later, as it does in the Lord's Prayer. Confession and Absolution found place among the Versicles and Responses preceding the Collects. But the first thought was that of rejoicing praise offered by the lips of accepted children to the gracious and loving Father, and the general course of the services, consciously or unconsciously, corresponds quite curiously to the structure of the Lord's Prayer itself. With that Prayer it began, after the first Invocation

of the Threefold Name which reminded each baptized soul of its covenant sonship in the family of God, Whom it salutes not as its Father only, but, in the '*Our Father*,' bears its brethren also together with itself into the holy Presence. The Psalms of Praise, with the repeated *Gloria*, carry out the idea of the next clause of the *Pater noster*, 'Hallowed be Thy Name.' The Lessons and their responsive Canticles tell us of the Kingdom of God, prophesied in the Old, incipiently realized in the New Testament; and in conjunction with the Creed and its expression of faith in Him Who is the Bread of Life, are the spiritual answer to 'Give us this day our daily bread.' The Lord's Prayer itself then follows as the link or keystone which binds the Service of Praise which has gone before with the Service of Prayer that follows. Its closing petitions begin with that humble prayer for forgiveness which is naturally first, when we pass from the thought of 'Our Father' to the thought of ourselves, especially in the light of that covenanted sonship and of those unspeakable mercies of redemption for which we have been offering praise. And this was the exactly analogous position of the Confession and Prayer for forgiveness in the older Services, leading to those collects and prayers and intercessions for our own and our brethren's needs, which answer to the last two of the Seven Petitions of the Lord's Prayer. Thus the whole Office may be said to have grown out of, or radiated from, or been crystallized round, the central *Pater noster*, the erasure of which is therefore, to a liturgical mind, simply intolerable, whether dictated by a fanciful dread of repetition—if anything will bear repetition surely the Lord's Prayer will—or by an impatient aim at shortening, or by whatever motive. Certainly if one must go, we had far rather it were the opening and introductory use of the Lord's Prayer in the Daily Office, which anciently was said *secreto*, and not its solemn use as the crown and climax of the Office, to which all that goes before leads up, out of which grows, and on which hangs, all that follows.

4. Scarcely less astonishing was the erasure of the Church's specially inspired and daily immemorial Thanksgivings for the Incarnation, the *Magnificat* and the *Nunc dimittis*, and—worse almost than its erasure—the mutilation of the *Benedictus* by the omission of all the verses after the fourth. *Deo gratias*, all this is amended in the *Book Annexed*, which yet, most oddly, preserves the scar in the *Benedictus*, by leaving a space between verses 4 and 5! But perhaps this is intended as a wholesome if humbling reminder of past sins, and a gentle suggestion of the propriety of some inward act of

pena
inse
nost

dar
we
to m
som
in th
diffe
Divi
of th
her
Psal
we r
see i

S
jewel
depre
Cath
with
large
Joint

T
tive
ventu
throu
Office
portio
omiss
and c
the e
Absol
that
the J
Absol
munio
that, v
the alt
the ol
Lord
space
and co
precise
in a p

penance at that point. If this be so, we would suggest the insertion of a very significant blank space between the *Pater noster* and the *Preces*, when the former is replaced.

5. Similar, but less serious, was the excision in the Standard Book of the last four verses of the *Venite*, verses which we should—after their pointed use in Heb. iii. and iv., not to mention I Cor. x.—have thought to carry a very wholesome and needed warning against hardness and unfruitfulness in the midst of privileges. They are as appropriate, in a different way, as are the earlier verses, at the beginning of Divine Service; and, we had always thought, were a large part of the reason why the Ancient Church adopted Psalm xcv. as her Invitatory. At any rate, God, in His inspiration of the Psalmist, joined the two portions of the Psalm together, and we rejoice to see the American Church of to-day has come to see it was a pity they were ever put asunder.

Surely, changes such as these, removing the very choicest jewels of its ordinary worship, mark the very nadir of spiritual depression to which anything which still held to the name of Catholic could possibly abase itself. We rejoice, accordingly, with our American brethren of the present generation at the large amount of recovery witnessed to by the labours of the Joint Committee.

Too free use of option, whether of substitution of alternative forms, or negatively by way of omission, seems, as we ventured to say in our former article, undesirable when it affects throughout any one essential or important constituent of any Office. We mean that it is one thing within the Prayer-portion (for example) of a service to allow on occasion some omission, or some addition or substitution of authorized forms, and quite another thing to permit to individual 'discretion' the entire expression of some one necessary element, the Absolution (for example), or the Belief, by this form or by that. Yet this is what the American Church does, and what the Joint Committee proposes to continue. For the Daily Absolution its existing Book offers the form in the Communion Office as an alternative. The *Book Annexed* reserves that, we are glad to see, to its own proper place, and offers, as the alternative to the Daily Absolution, the short form from the old Prime and Compline, 'The Almighty and merciful Lord grant you absolution and remission of all your sins, space for true repentance, amendment of life, and the grace and consolation of the Holy Spirit. Amen.' If the forms are precisely equivalent, neither more nor less, why any alternative in a public service? Similarly, we see no good reason for,

and many against, the optional use of the Nicene Creed in the Daily Office in place of the Apostles', an alternative which the *Book Annexed* still permits, though, in printing, it omits the Nicene from its present place in Morning and Evening Prayer, and prints it only in its proper place in the Liturgy, thus favouring and suggesting the Catholic usage, though apparently forbidding its recitation in the Liturgy, if either Creed *hath been used immediately before in the Morning Prayer*.

The 'squeamish' alterations of certain phrases in the *Te Deum*, Litany, and Baptismal Services are still retained. In a matter of this sort it is, of course, impossible to go back after three generations of use.

Between the *Te Deum* and *Benedicite* the *Book Annexed* inserts, as an alternative Cantic, the six verses, beginning 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord God of our fathers,' which, in the *Song of the Three Holy Children* in the Apocrypha, are prefixed to the *Benedicite*. After the *Jubilate* it gives, as a further alternative, Ps. cxxi., *Levavi oculos*.

At Evening Prayer the *Book Annexed* inserts, after the opening sentences, the brief invitation, 'Let us humbly confess our sins before Almighty God,' followed by the full 'Dearly beloved brethren' as an optional alternative only, an arrangement in which we heartily agree, and offers a newly composed alternative Confession, of which we do not quite see the need. It restores the *Magnificat* and *Nunc dimittis*, but does not follow the sensible example of the Revised Irish Prayer-Book, in giving a suitable alternative Collect, instead of 'Lighten our darkness,' for use at 'Evening' Services concluded long before dark. It removes the *Prayer of S. Chrysostom*, and substitutes 'Assist us mercifully, O Lord,' with the heading, *A Prayer for God's Guidance and Defence*. We have long felt the need of some change from the one invariable epilogue of Mattins, Evensong, and Litany, the *Prayer of S. Chrysostom*. But our inclination would have been to reverse the arrangement of the *Book Annexed*, so using 'Assist us' (which was the old concluding Prayer at Prime) in the morning, to which its language seems more suitable—witness its use in the *Itinerarium*—and keeping S. Chrysostom for the evening, in memory of the fact that the first fulfilment of the promise of S. Matt. xviii. 20, to which it alludes, took place on the evening of the first Easter night. Similarly we should prefer something else for the close of the Litany, where the *Book Annexed* still retains the *Prayer of S. Chrysostom*.

Following Evening Prayer, we observe one of the most

noti
titles
alter
song
Mini
in th
went
have
to T
Beat
Lore
after
Colle
Wise
and I
P
Even
ment
servi
rate
the A
to wh
prefix
Colle
blessi
T
permi
the m
on Ch
ordina
margin
of Pri
the pr
as the
Ordin
shoul
the L
only i
going
The r
of—
selves
further
Bishop
Churc

noticeable of the proposed 'enrichments,' viz., an office entitled 'The Beatitudes of the Gospel,' to be used as an alternative for the Prayers after the third Collect at Evensong, or as a separate office. The people kneeling, the Minister, standing, recites, much as the Decalogue is recited in the Communion Service, verses 1-10 of S. Matt. v., 'Jesus went up into a mountain,' &c., the response or Kyrie, 'Lord have mercy upon us; and be it unto Thy servants according to Thy word,' being inserted after each of the first seven Beatitudes, and 'Let Thy loving mercy come also unto us, O Lord, even Thy salvation according to [?] unto] Thy word,' after the eighth. Then, after 'Let us pray' follow two new Collects, *For Grace to seek Spiritual Blessings*, and *For Wisdom*; and, as a closing benediction, 'The Lord bless us and keep us,' &c.

Perhaps the only objections to this are that its use at Evensong would involve the sacrifice of the intercessory element in that office, an element without which (we think) no service is complete; and that it is itself incomplete as a separate office in having no Lord's Prayer. Surely for such use the *Kyrie* and *Pater* should be inserted after the *Oremus*, to which, in any case, the *Dominus vobiscum* might well be prefixed. Provision should also be made for the saying the Collect of the day or week, and for the insertion before the blessing of any special prayers or intercessions.

To the Litany the *Book Annexed* prefixes a new rubric, permitting its use 'on any day in Lent, at the discretion of the minister,' and a note that it 'may be omitted altogether on *Christmas-day*, *Easter-day*, and *Whitsun-day*.' After the ordinary Suffrage for 'all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,' this marginal rubric is placed, 'At the Ordering of Deacons and of Priests, and at the Consecration of Bishops, here followeth the proper Suffrage.' This is apparently for economy of space, as the *Book Annexed* does not reprint the Litany in the Ordinal. Might we suggest that the three proper Suffrages should be printed, not in the Ordinal, but in their place in the Litany, with a view to their use on Ordination days not only in the Churches where the Ordinations were actually going on, but in all the Churches throughout the diocese? The rubric should then run, 'On the days of the Ordination of — or the Consecration of, &c.;' and in the Suffrages themselves the word 'now' should be altered into 'this day.' A further slight change would be needed in the Suffrage for Bishops. Surely it would be a great gain thus to remind the Church at large of the solemn function then going on, and

to enable all her congregations to take part in this way in what so closely concerns her welfare.

The next section of the work of the Joint Committee which invites our attention is the very important one (pp. 37-54), of its Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings;¹ a feature in which the poverty of our Anglican use is perhaps more painfully apparent than anywhere else. Setting aside our prayer *for All Conditions* and General Thanksgiving, which the American books very sensibly print in their customary places of use at Morning and Evening Prayer, we have only nine special prayers (some of which² can really hardly be used as they stand) for seven occasional objects, and seven special Thanksgivings for six special occasions. To these the American Standard Book added six special prayers, viz., For a Sick Person, Sick Child, Persons at Sea, Persons afflicted, For Condemned Malefactors, and for Convention, with the corresponding appropriate Thanksgiving. The Revised Irish Prayer Book of 1878 proceeded further in the same improvement, and added prayers for Unity, Rogation Days, New Year's Day, Christian Missions, and for Colleges and Schools, those for the last four objects being new, beside improving the prayer against Plague. This book provides altogether for fourteen special objects. The proposed American Revision offers thirty-nine prayers for thirty-five special objects!—i.e., to those of the Standard Book it adds, first, seven prayers, For Persons on a Journey, Candidates for Confirmation, All dependent on the Public Care, Missions, The Increase of the Ministry, Fruitful Seasons, In a Vacancy of a Cure, all which are newly composed. These prayers, twenty-two in number, are 'to be used before the General Thanksgiving at Morning and Evening Service, or else before the two final prayers, if the office be one in which the General Thanksgiving hath not its usual place.'³ Then it adds, as a sort of second

¹ Surely in the *Book Annexed* the running title, or page-heading, should be, not 'Prayers and Thanksgivings' through the whole section, but 'Prayers upon several Occasions' over the Prayers, and 'Thanksgivings upon several Occasions' over the Thanksgivings.

² We mean especially those for Rain, Fair Weather, and in Time of War. A very good general prayer for the objects of the first two of these, and one which might equally well suit the Rogation season, might be formed from the first two, thus: 'O God, Heavenly Father, who by Thy Son Jesus Christ hast promised to all them that seek Thy kingdom and the righteousness thereof all things necessary to their bodily sustenance: send us, we beseech Thee, such weather as that we may receive the fruits of the earth in due season, to our comfort, and to Thy honour and glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord.'

³ What does this mean? Not apparently the Litany, at the close of

divisi
after
other
the fi
and
and
four
Of t
Inter
who b
two n
Even
Ancie
know
Patie
An I
Inter
and a
with
gain,
Yet t
only
wanti
the tw
try' q
impor
least
the H
for th
miss

which
usual
Service
¹ D
Collect
² D
munio
purely
for the
added
before
Deaco
labour
Unity,
very s
Faith
outer

division, seventeen prayers and collects which 'may be said after the collects' of Morning and Evening Prayer, and at other fit times at the discretion of the Minister.'² Of those, the first four are *For a Blessing upon Instruction, For Grace and Governance, For God's Compassion upon our Infirmities, and For an Answer to our Prayers*, and are in fact the last four of our six collects appended to the Communion Service. Of the remainder, that *For the Spirit of Prayer*, and the *Intercession for those who labour in the Gospel*, and *For those who live in sin*, are of our own Dr. Bright's composition, while two more, *For the Renewing of the Holy Ghost*, and the second *Evening Prayer*, are based upon translations of his in his *Ancient Collects*. This leaves eight, which are, so far as we know, entirely new, viz., *For the Light of God's Truth*, *For Patience under Suffering*, *For Grace to speak the Truth in Love*, *An Intercession for those who err from the Faith*, *A General Intercession* (very full and very good), two Morning prayers and another Evening prayer. All this supplies the Church with a very full repertory of special Prayers, and is a great gain, a gain which we trust may ere long be our own also. Yet the very length of the step taken towards completeness only makes us the more earnestly hope that what is still wanting here may yet be supplied. For we do not think that the two Prayers 'For Missions' and the 'Increase of the Ministry' quite sufficiently represent this primary and most vitally important department of the Church's work. We should at least like to have special Prayers for Missionaries, and for the Home Heathen of our overgrown town populations, and for the blessing of God on special Parochial Missions. We miss also the Prayer for Unity among Christians, and would

which the *Book Annexed* does print the General Thanksgiving 'in its usual place.' Yet it seems odd not to use special Prayers in the Litany Service, on occasion.

¹ Does this mean next after the Collect of the Day, or after the Third Collect? It ought to mean the former.

² Does this include permission to insert these Collects in the Communion Office? And if so, at what point? Such as are Prayers for purely spiritual blessings might well be said immediately after the Collect for the day. Such as are special Intercessions might conceivably be added after the Church Militant Prayer; or better perhaps immediately before the Blessing. Only, in this case, they should be 'bid' by the Deacon turning to the people, and saying, 'Let us pray for those who labour in the Gospel,' or 'For those who err from the faith,' or 'For Unity,' or 'For those who live in sin,' &c. There would be something very solemn in this special parting intercession by the Communicant Faithful before leaving the sanctuary and the nearer Presence for the outer world.

add Collects before Holy Communion, or for a Communicants' Class, also For the Bishop of the Diocese, For a Sick Person near death,¹ For Bereaved Relatives, For our Christian Brethren, *e.g.* of the East, under Infidel Rulers. Such Collects as Trin. v., xv., xvi., and xxii. might also be indicated for occasional use on behalf of the Church at large. And, further, we cannot help wishing that fuller use had been made, as easily might have been, of the rich treasures of ancient devotion, now so well known and accessible, in the especial direction of additional Prayers for Grace.

The Standard American Book has no Communion Service. It simply prints after the Ash Wednesday collect the three last prayers of our service, for use at the close of the Litany on Ash Wednesday immediately before the General Thanksgiving. The *Book Annexed* inserts at page 55, next after the Occasional Thanksgiving, as 'a Penitential Office for Ash Wednesday,' and 'at other times, at the discretion of the minister,' the *Miserere* and the rest of our service exactly as it stands, even to the non-restoration of the clause omitted (accidentally, by a mere printer's error, as we have always supposed) from the Benedictory formula of Numbers vi.

This is followed (pp. 58-64) by the very full 'Proper Order for Morning Prayer'—though its contents would be equally suitable for Afternoon or Evening—'on Thanksgiving Day otherwise named Harvest Home.' This excellent office does include our Accession Service Prayer for *Unity*, and a prayer for all Poor, Homeless, and Neglected Folk.

Next we find a wholly new 'Short Office of Prayer for sundry occasions, such, *e.g.*, as Noon-day Services, Missionary Meetings, the Visitation of Families and Neighbourhoods, the Catechizing of Children in Churches or Schools, and on other like occasions, for which no special order of prayer hath been appointed.' This certainly supplies a want. Its structure is, Opening Sentences, V. R., 'Let us pray'; Our Father, V. R., Gloria, &c., any Psalm or Selection, Lesson, Hymn, or Anthem,

¹ We have known the Visitation Prayer, 'when there appeareth but small hope of recovery,' used with very good effect in a parish church when the death of a parishioner was daily and hourly expected, 'here lying' being changed into 'now lying'; and the sentence 'We know, O Lord, . . . Yet' being simply represented by 'And.' Similarly, after the death of such an one, especially after long part in the Prayers of the Church as a special sufferer, the first Collect of the Burial Service has been found most appropriate for public use in church, the central clause being worded thus: 'We give Thee hearty thanks for all those our brethren and sisters whom it hath pleased Thee to deliver out of the miseries of this sinful world, and especially for Thy servant N.; beseeching Thee,' &c.

or Ca
the C
Our
Lord
Lord
prefe
we ha
arran
secon
have
bling
only
Glori
addre
imme
A
congr
richm
work
churc
T
Book
as the
omiss
ation
the H
dress
is a
Holy
sent,
essen
admis
use ha
its use
not p
becom
menta
questi
access
In
really
worst
Comm
rubric
Office

or Canticle, Apostles' Creed, 'The Lord be with you,' &c., V. R., the Collect, any other Prayers from the Prayer Book, Blessing. Our only objection here is the absence of the *Kyrie* and Lord's Prayer at the beginning of the Prayer portion. If the Lord's Prayer may not be twice said, we should certainly prefer to omit it at the beginning. In services of this kind we have found it convenient, especially in places where the arrangements for kneeling are not quite perfect, to avoid a second call to kneel almost immediately after those present have risen from their short act of secret devotion on assembling. We should prefer to say, after the opening sentences, only the two Verses, with their Responses, leading up to the Gloria. There is no direction as to the place of any sermon, address, or catechizing. Perhaps their best place would be immediately after the Lesson.

And so we pass from this division of the Book, heartily congratulating our American brethren on the amount of enrichment here proposed, and hoping to see it include, ere the work is over, a late Evening Service, or Compline, for use in churches, community chapels, and families.

Turning to the Occasional Services, we observe that the *Book Annexed* makes no change in the three forms of Baptism as they were altered in the Standard Book; *i.e.*, the optional omission, in Infant Baptism, of the Gospel and 'brief exhortation' following, of the solemn congregational invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the infant, and of the preliminary address to the sponsors before the questions, still remains. This is a very serious blot; for that solemn prayer, 'Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant,' &c., audibly joined in by all present, is surely a most important, most significant, and almost essential element in the great act of the corporate Church, the admission of new members. But perhaps its congregational use had died out in America; as was indeed probable, when its use at all was merely optional; and so its deep meaning was not perceived. There is always a serious risk of minimums becoming the rule. In the solemn action of a public Sacramental Service there ought to be nothing optional. The question here is of something more than of mere dispensable accessories.

In connexion with this it seems natural to note, what is really another most serious, and even dangerous, blot, the worst indeed that has been suffered to remain by the Joint Committee. It is the extraordinary and almost incredible rubric prefixed in the American Standard Book to the Burial Office, to the effect that it is 'not to be used for any unbap-

tized adults'; i.e., it may be used for unbaptized infants and children. From this, of course, results a direct teaching, which many in the present day are only too ready to assimilate, that baptism in the case of any but adults is a thing indifferent. The American Church thus teaches all but explicitly that it is all one whether souls are or are not members of the Body of Christ, which none can be without baptism, and that the same words of hope of *the same* resurrection, and the same glorious resurrection lesson, are applicable to baptized and unbaptized alike, if not adults. This is utterly unscriptural. The New Testament phrases to 'be *in Christ*,' to 'be Christ's,' or to 'sleep *in Him*,' have a perfectly definite meaning, and point to a distinct 'resurrection,' different both in time and in character from the general resurrection of the uncovenanted saved and lost. We are very far indeed from saying that 'those that are without' are all necessarily lost; but we do think it a very grave thing to blur the New Testament distinction between them and the 'saints.' New Testament truth may well be, and no doubt is, much above present faith and practice. Yet it does not, for all that, admit of dilution or accommodation. The Church is 'the pillar and ground of the truth;' and must hand on that which she has received, whether men hear or whether they forbear. Possibly there is need of some special office for the burial of the unbaptized, whether children or others, which should be charitable, kindly, and reverent, dwelling on the general truths of natural religion, but not, as in the nature of the case it never can be, distinctively Christian in its reference to the deceased. The *Book Annexed*, leaving this obnoxious rubric untouched before the usual Burial Service, provides a new service for the burial of 'infants or young children,' with this initial rubric: 'The office shall be as usual, save that the following alternative forms may be used at the discretion of the minister.' But it is in fact a complete office, and could be used as it stands, yet only with propriety for baptized children, to whose case, however, there is no sign of limitation.

The Confirmation Service is considerably and (we think) happily 'enriched,' and made more solemn and significant, by the insertion, next after the preface, of (1) Acts viii. 12-17, as a lesson; and (2) a formal presentation of the candidates by the Minister to the Bishop. There is also an express renewal of the three vows, of Repentance, Faith, and Obedience, the candidates being asked by the Bishop, as in our Baptismal Service, 'Dost thou renounce,' &c., 'Dost thou

believe
be very
the mo
is the
the rec

Th
omissi
God th
inserts
prayer
inserts
latter p
hint o
a mar
guess
ment f

Th
differs
'Speci
in the
the ad
tion,"
and o
The A
'Short
of spe
here th
act of
solemn
of alt
results
the fo
the bu
Is the
and w
an eco

Th
prefix
the B
and n
munic
be tw
wheth
minist
Bible

believe,' &c., 'Wilt thou obediently keep,' &c. This would be very impressive; but it would, we fear, rather encourage the most erroneous view that the chief thing in Confirmation is the candidate's renewal of his baptismal vows instead of the reception of a special grace.

The standard Marriage Service, besides its 'squeamish' omissions, stops short after the first Blessing, 'God the Father, God the Son,' &c., omitting all that follows, except that it inserts the Lord's Prayer between the 'Let us pray' and the prayer 'O Eternal God.' Before this last the *Book Annexed* inserts the prayer 'O God of Abraham,' &c., from the omitted latter portion; but agrees with the present use in giving no hint of a possible celebration of the Holy Communion at a marriage, nor of any exhortation or address. We cannot guess at the reasons which have stayed the wave of enrichment from reaching this point.

The present Visitation Service of the American Church differs from our own in the exclusion of the Rubric about 'Special Confession together with the Absolution following; in the substitution of the *De profundis* for Psalm lxxi., and in the addition of prayers "In behalf of all present at the Visitation," and "In case of sudden surprise and immediate danger," and of a "Thanksgiving for the beginning of a recovery." The *Book Annexed* offers four additional forms, including 'Short Prayers with the Dying,' but does not restore the offer of special confession and individual absolution. Compare here the option (which *Book Annexed* still retains) in the very act of the ordering of Priests, of a much weaker form for the solemn words 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' &c. This large use of alternatives in supremely important acts most certainly results in the trumpet's giving a very 'uncertain sound.' If the forms are equivalent, why an alternative? If not, it is the business of the Church to say distinctly which she means. Is there a special *charisma* of the Holy Ghost 'for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God?' or is there only an ecclesiastical 'authority'?

The awkward wording of the last clause of our Rubric prefixed to the Communion of the Sick is so far corrected by the *Book Annexed* as to make it clear that it is the minister and not the sick person who is to celebrate the Holy Communion; but the doubt whether the 'two at the least' are to be two besides, or two counting in the sick person—*i.e.* whether 'with him' means with the sick person, or with the minister, still remains. By way of 'enrichment' Psalm cxvii., Bible version, with *Gloria*, is prefixed as a sort of Introit,

followed by the *Kyrie*, *Dominus vobiscum*, and *Oremus*. This is, of course, the wrong order. The two last should come before the *Kyrie*; and it is unliturgical to use the *Kyrie* without the *Pater* immediately following. On the whole we think this office better as it stands.

The Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea in the Standard Book are much like our own. The *Book Annexed* arranges them in a much better order, and adds a new prayer 'For Merchantmen.'

The Standard form for the Visitation of Prisoners, a service which, with the American form of Institution of Ministers, we should do well to adopt, remains much the same in the *Book Annexed*; as also do the forms of Family Prayer, another excellent feature of the American book, the *Book Annexed* adding only to the morning form a clause for use when the Holy Communion is to be celebrated.

We next reach the Psalter, to which we find prefixed, not only the Easter Anthem for *Venite*, but similar proper anthems for Christmas-day, Ascension-day, Whitsun-day, and Trinity Sunday. These are good, and (we think) might, like that for Easter, be permitted to be used throughout the Octave. In the Psalter itself there is no change, beyond the undoubtedly correct transference of Psalm cxli. from the morning to the evening of the 29th day. The two obvious considerations, of the comparative length (Morning, forty-eight verses; Evening, twenty-one verses), and of the phrase in cxli. 2, 'an evening sacrifice,' long ago convinced us of some (probably, at first, a printer's) error here.

In the Pontifical portion of the Prayer-Book, which includes, besides the Ordinal, the forms for Consecration of a Church or Chapel (but not of a Burial-ground), and the Office of Institution, we observe, in the Ordinal, which closely follows our own, no change calling for remark, except the alternative formula for the actual ordering of Priests to which we have already adverted. The form for the Consecration of a Church, as printed in the *Book Annexed*, is scarcely altered from that now in use, which, except in substituting Mattins for Litany, is very like the ordinary English form. Its chief defects are, that, in the Ante-Communion, it substitutes the *Gubilate* for the Nicene Creed, and does not prescribe a Celebration, but expressly contemplates the service ending with the Blessing after the Sermon. This is greatly to be regretted. The Consecration of the Blessed Sacrament within it is the truest Consecration of the new Church. Perhaps it was hardly to be expected that the service should include the

solemn
ture, th
should
Lord,'
blessing
work o
on tho
Also th
gloriou
The
very fu
ourselv
Stand
and en
Priest
restora
Service
by pr
'Holy
assign
himsel
Institu
Comm
Dioces
Anthe
of the
presen
consta
to our

¹ S
varied
my Go
keeper
appoint
To Th
with al
Thy L
Ghost
Thou
salvati
both b
rightly
me in
in prai
fill me
readin
lency
Christ

solemn dedication to their holy uses of the necessary furniture, the *instrumenta* and *ornamenta* of the Church ; but we should like to see, in the prayer 'Blessed be Thy Name, O Lord,' a distinct petition, as in the English use, for God's blessing on those who have given of their substance and the work of their hands for the erection of His House, as well as on those who are to enjoy the benefit of their pious work. Also the opening address of the Collect should run, 'O most glorious Lord God.'

The 'Office of Institution,' which, first put forth in 1804, very fully and admirably supplies a need greatly felt among ourselves, is left by the Joint Committee much as it is in the Standard Book. Among its valuable features are the clear and emphatic assertion of the true relation of the Christian Priest and Pastor to his congregation, and the no less marked restoration of the phrase 'the Altar,' as in our own Coronation Service, as the Scripture equivalent, abundantly witnessed to by primitive Christian and Catholic usage, for the terms 'Holy Table' or 'Table of the Lord.' The *Book Annexed* assigns the Institution primarily and normally to the Bishop himself, and omits the form of Mandate to be sent to the Instituting Priest, by 'the Clerical Members of the Standing Committee' in the case (happily, no longer possible), of 'a Diocese in which there is no Bishop.' In place of a Cento Anthem it suggests Psalm lxviii. or Psalm xxvi. The prayer of the newly-instituted minister, 'kneeling at the Altar, to present his supplication for himself,' is excellent, and might be constantly used by all clergymen with advantage.¹ Contrary to our usual criticism on this point, we think that, seeing the

¹ Some among us have long used it, in the following form, very slightly varied (we think, rather for the better) from the American use :—'O Lord my God, I am unworthy to come under Thy roof, or even to be a door-keeper in Thy Holy House ; yet Thou hast honoured Thy servant by appointing him to stand before Thee, and to serve at Thy Holy Altar. To Thee and to Thy service I devote myself, my body, soul, and spirit, with all their powers and faculties. Fill my memory with the words of Thy Law ; enlighten my understanding with the illumination of the Holy Ghost ; and may all the wishes and desires of my will centre in what Thou hast commanded. And to make me instrumental in promoting the salvation of Thy people [now] committed to my charge, grant that I may, both by my life and doctrine, set forth Thy true and lively Word and rightly and duly administer Thy Holy Sacraments. Be Thou ever with me in all the duties of my ministry ; in prayer, to quicken my devotion ; in praise, to heighten my love and gratitude ; in teaching and guiding, to fill me with the Spirit of wisdom and counsel ; in preaching, to give me readiness of thought and expression suitable to the clearness and excellency of Thy Holy Word. Grant this, O Father, for the sake of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Saviour. Amen.'

Institution follows immediately upon full Morning Prayer, the *Pater noster* might be omitted after the Collect 'Direct us, O Lord.' We would also suggest that the instituted Minister, upon his standing up, after his personal supplication before the Altar, should say, as his first salutation to his people, 'Peace be to this parish and this congregation; in the Name, &c. Amen,' and then, 'The Lord be with you,' &c., and the Lord's Prayer might well be inserted, with preceding *Kyrie*, after 'Let us pray,' so becoming the first united prayer of the new pastor and his flock. A few appropriate versicles would also come in well after the Lord's Prayer. The closing rubrics direct that the new minister shall 'always pronounce' the Benediction, even when the Bishop is present, and instituting. We had rather not interfere with the rule that the Diocesan, or Provincial, Bishop should always, if officially present, give the Blessing; and we think our suggestion above, as to the salutation of Peace, might remove any possible reason for infringing it in this case. The very point of the Institution Service is that the Bishop is really the Chief Pastor, and that the Parish Priest takes mission from him, as his local delegate.

On the whole we very heartily congratulate our Transatlantic brothers on the labours of their Joint Committee. We hope their recommendations may be adopted, and more in the same direction; and that the two or three serious blemishes which we have felt constrained to point out, and to lament, may be removed from the book in the form finally adopted. And, further, we very earnestly trust that this work, which has been, very evidently, so carefully and conscientiously done, may speedily, by way of example and precedent, bear fruit in a like process of 'enrichment' among ourselves.

Reveale
Be
Ri
bu

Is The
branch
willing
much
they w
save th
speedy
hand, t
selves
calumn
fathers
every c

It
form o
or per
that w
but on
that th
of a fu
the do
object
would
us if it
is this
though
think
becaus
so; pe
would
true.

No
the be

1 T
so late
lecture
or the l

ART. X.—THEOLOGY AS A SCIENCE.

Revealed Religion expounded by its Relations to the Moral Being of God. (The Bedell Lecture for 1883.¹) By the Right Rev. HENRY COTTERILL, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh. (London, 1884.)

Is Theology to be regarded as a branch of poetry, or as a branch of science? This is a question which theologians, willingly or unwillingly, must answer, and on the answer to which much depends. If they include it in the domain of poetry, they will get rid of many difficulties, reconcile many enemies, save themselves much trouble—and prepare for their creed a speedy and certain, if a painless, extinction. If, on the other hand, they elect to call it a science, they must prepare themselves for continual struggle, continual misrepresentation and calumny; but they will be carrying on the fight which their fathers fought before them, and the final victory will be nearer every day.

It may well be asked how theology can be regarded as a form of poetry, or who does so regard it. But is it not this, or perilously near it, when we are told, as we are so often, that we should accept religion not on the ground of reason, but on the ground of faith; that the two are different faculties; that the grounds on which, for instance, we hold the doctrine of a future life are quite distinct from those on which we hold the doctrine of universal gravitation; and that we must not object if the evidence for the former theory is not such as would satisfy the reason, not such as would commend it to us if it were a mere point of physics like the latter? What is this but saying that faith is a matter of emotion, and not of thought; that we call ourselves Christians, not because we think that, according to the evidence, Christianity *is* true, but because we think it ought to be true, and wish that it were so; perhaps also because, even if it were false, we fancy it would be better for ourselves and others to treat it as being true.

Now, on this latter point at least, as we have said, all the best and most influential of the sceptics will be with us.

¹ The Bedell Lecture is a foundation made by a husband and wife, so lately as 1880, in the Theological College of the Ohio Diocese, for 'a lecture or lectures on the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion, or the Relations of Science and Religion.'

They will quite admit that the belief in religion has been a potent influence for good in the past of the world's history; that it is a potent influence for good even in the present, to those who can still persuade themselves into an opinion of its reality. 'By all means,' they will say, 'keep your faith, as you call it, as long as you can. We would not deprive you of it. To feminine minds, and to those male minds which have a feminine touch in them, it is of considerable value.

"Leave thou thy sister, while she prays,
Her early faith, her happy views."

That is quite our feeling. We shall be glad to go with you as far as we conscientiously can; to join you in admiring the beauty, in praising the sweetness of the old legends, and in tracing out the really rich and valuable thoughts which formed the groundwork and occasion of many of them. All we ask is that you should not press us to say anything as to their historical truth, about which, followers as we must be of reason, we can of course have only one opinion.'

In one word, such men patronize religion for their woman-kind, as prosaic fathers patronize poetry for their children.

The view here taken will be repudiated doubtless by all into whose hands these pages are likely to fall. They will not admit for a moment that to them religion is a matter of emotion, not of judgment, and that they keep their belief in it for the same reasons for which they might wish to keep their belief, for instance, in the story of William Tell. Be it so. We welcome their adhesion, but they must take the consequences. If theology is a matter of evidence, not emotion, then theology is a science. It must be studied by the methods of science, subjected to the laws of science, and must stand or fall by the results of such an examination. Now the methods of science are perfectly well known and understood: they are not many, but one. To arrive at truth, on any subject whatever, there is one process, and but one, which has ever succeeded or will succeed. It consists (1) in impartial and careful investigation of the facts; (2) in the induction from those facts of general principles from which they may be supposed to flow; (3) in the verification of the truth of these principles, by showing that they, and they alone, suffice to explain the old facts and to reveal new ones.

If, then, theology is a science, if she wishes to commend herself to those who are students of science, it is thus and thus only that she must proceed. It is needless to waste time in pointing out how widely such procedure differs from

that of modern scientific (as in fact, value is wanted foundation our reason

Nor theology against a it as she of the p of doctri —the a debated whether a Cathol Christian scarcely citly or and goo complete and con very two foundly of the A Practica opinion that moe unhistor man's o deep fee predomi a God w It is obv of these knows n an inexp be amor which, b facts wh as its fir of sight it will fi VOL.

that of nearly all recognized works on theology, ancient or modern. And the conclusion can only be that in the eyes of scientific students the great mass of such works will appear (as in fact they do appear) of no value whatever. At any rate, valuable or not, they are not what is wanted now. What is wanted is a theology which shall lay deep and broad the foundation-truths of religion, and shall prove those truths to our reason, not recommend them to our faith.

Nor can it be maintained that by adopting this line, theology will abrogate her office as the defender of the faith against assaults from without. On the contrary, she will fulfil it as she has never perhaps done before. For the assaults of the present day are delivered, not against particular points of doctrine or discipline, but against the very first principles—the axioms and postulates—of religion. What is really debated now—in all but exclusively clerical circles—is, not whether it is a man's duty to be a Calvinist or an Arminian, a Catholic or a Protestant, but whether it is his duty to be a Christian or an Atheist. Again, to take an example, there is scarcely a work on theology which does not assume, implicitly or explicitly, (1) that there is a God infinite in wisdom and goodness, as well as power; (2) that He has given us a complete revelation of His will, written in His own words, and contained in the Holy Scriptures. But these are the very two questions which at this moment are the most profoundly debated and discussed. What are the true causes of the Atheism of to-day, so far as it is genuine and impartial? Practically they are two (and here we are not speaking from opinion only, but from experience). The first is a conviction that modern science has proved the story of the Bible to be unhistorical, its miracles to be impossible, and its account of man's origin and nature to be erroneous. The second is a deep feeling that the existence, or at least the extent and predominance of evil, cannot be reconciled with the being of a God who is at once infinitely powerful and perfectly good. It is obvious that, except as regards historical criticism, neither of these forms of doubt is touched by current theology, which knows nothing of modern science, and which accepts evil as an inexplicable fact. But it is equally obvious that they will be among the first questions to be treated by a new theology, which, basing itself upon science, must take account of the facts which science has established, and which, taking always as its first work the collection of facts, cannot well leave out of sight a fact so glaring and intrusive as that of evil. Hence it will find itself from the commencement in presence of the

two schools of scepticism which we have indicated, will examine their premisses, detect their errors, and doubtless lay them to rest ere long in that kind limbo of oblivion in which so many other schools, once no less flourishing and triumphant, lie unhonoured and unregarded.

Whether the criticisms we have thus ventured to indicate as to current theology be well founded or not, they at least do not apply to the volume now before us. Though in itself pretending to be no more than a sketch, it may well serve as an introduction, a starting-point for the theology of the future. It is written by one who combines skill in science with knowledge of theology in a degree which is at least rare at the present time, and it is written in exactly the spirit of careful and temperate research, the need of which we have endeavoured to indicate. It is also devoted explicitly, not, indeed, to answering the first question of theology, which must needs be, *Is there a God?* but the second, scarcely in itself less important, at least from a practical standpoint, *If there be a God, what is His character?*

To show how fully the views we have ventured to express are shared by an authority so competent and so unprejudiced, we may take the following from a section of the first Lecture (p. 8), which we would fain quote at length did space permit:—

'It is a remarkable fact, but undoubtedly it is true, that in this scientific age there is a strong tendency, not only among those who do not believe in Christianity—where we might expect it—but even among many sincere and earnest, if not profound Christians, to disparage as unprofitable, if not injurious to spiritual life, theology, the science of religion. Whatever causes may have contributed to cause this feeling, the result is a very serious loss, both to the cause of Christianity as against infidelity, and not less to Christians themselves, and to the whole practical life of the Christian religion; for all knowledge is effective and profitable, not only in proportion as it is exact and definite, but also (and yet more) as it is seen to be related to central and fundamental principles; by which two elements, exactness and unity, science is distinguished from other knowledge.'

Bishop Cotterill does not attempt in the present book to lay down more than one of the principles of theology; but this is a principle so far-reaching and comprehensive, that it may almost be said to include all others. It is expressed in three words of S. John, '*God is Love.*' This is the essential character of God, the '*ἀρχή*' of all Divine revelations, as well as of all Divine operations and manifestations, and therefore certainly of all theologies.' We need not say how fully we agree with the Bishop in this statement; but though at least

as old
to theo
may po
idea of
Infinite
He is e
deified
solicited,
is the c
to which
The ide
to be m
out of
by Puri
idea of
scrutab
that na
from al
everlast
from si
being so
partial
at the s
love to
in the
Lastly,
mandin
pleted
fellowsh
once ex
abhorre
man's lo
against
his high
Hav
goes on
of Chris
the cent
the mys
him rely
to show
inscruta
on which
are part
ultimate

as old as the New Testament, it may fairly be said to be new to theology. Of the centuries since the revival of learning it may perhaps be said that in the seventeenth the predominant idea of God was that of Infinite Power, in the eighteenth of Infinite Wisdom, in the nineteenth of Infinite Goodnature. He is essentially 'Le bon Dieu' of modern France—a sort of deified stage-father, never so happy as when, almost unsolicited, He is forgiving the peccadilloes of His children. This is the conception which modern culture holds up as the model to which God, if there were a God, would conform Himself. The idea is less repulsive, but we are not sure but we hold it to be more degrading, than that of the stern, pitiless meter-out of penalties who is represented to us by Calvinistic and by Puritan teaching. We need not say that Bishop Cotterill's idea of love is not this; nor yet that of some unknown inscrutable attribute of Divinity to which we choose to give that name. It is love as we know it on earth, only purified from all earthly taint and imperfection—strong, perfect, and everlasting. Following Butler, he observes that love differs from simple, absolute benevolence, in being personal and in being self-sacrificing. It differs again from the arbitrary and partial preference imagined by the Calvinist, in being infinite at the same time as it is personal, 'which means that God's love to myself personally is none the less than if there were in the whole creation no other object of the love of God.' Lastly, it differs from all other qualities or principles in demanding by its very nature reciprocity. It cannot be completed or satisfied except by the return of love, and by fellowship with the person who is loved. Hence we have at once explained to us the jealousy of God—that is, His abhorrence of everything which interferes with the return of man's love. Hence also we have explained the anger of God against sin, because sin is the fatal obstacle to man's attaining his highest good.

Having laid down this great principle, Bishop Cotterill goes on to mark out briefly the way in which the whole system of Christian faith and doctrine may be studied in relation to the central truth 'God is love.' He takes in the first place the mystery of the Trinity; and here we are sorry to find him relying on a well-known passage of Herbert Spencer, to show that physical science lands us in mysteries equally inscrutable and contradictory. Mr. Spencer is a broken reed on which to lean in scientific matters, and his statements are partly incorrect (for there is no contradiction among the ultimate principles of science), partly based on a confusion

as to the true meaning of knowledge. The doctrine of love, however, is shown to throw a flood of light upon this particular mystery, because, 'if it is intelligible to us that God is love, it is equally intelligible that there must be a worthy object of that love.'

In the third Lecture, the same principle is applied to the doctrine of the Redemption. Here we have, as so many passages in Scripture tell us, the signal and sufficient evidence of God's love to man. And this love, it is shown, is not a mere feeling of mercy and compassion, but of actual affection, similar in kind to that which subsists between the Persons of the Godhead. It is also shown how on the Christian scheme, and on that alone, man's deliverance is achieved by means which compel him to feel, not only gratitude, but love towards his Deliverer, inasmuch as those means were the suffering and death of the Deliverer Himself. And he points out how essential to redemption, taken as a manifestation of God's love, is the truth of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, for 'it is the fact that God gave His own Son to suffer and die for us that alone proves the love of God in redeeming us.' And it is this which gives the moral power to Christianity, enabling us to exhibit towards others some faint reflection of that love which God has exhibited towards us.

Lastly, the same principle is used to solve the great problem of moral evil, as in the following weighty passage:—

'Divine love, though infinite and almighty, could not fulfil its purposes towards man—that is, could not restore God's image and likeness in him—except he were one in whom such image and likeness were possible; which would be contradicted if we should deny the reality of the will in man. It is certain that any view of the will which represents it as incapable of resisting God's grace makes the mechanical relation of cause and effect the one law of the whole universe, and subjects to its mechanism the moral world no less than the physical; so that it must follow from such a view that the whole of God's creation, visible and invisible, is unspiritual. For the reality of will and therefore of responsibility alone distinguishes that which is natural from that which is spiritual' (p. 86).

Here we have clearly indicated the line of that great argument which reveals, and which stands alone in revealing, the why and the wherefore of evil. It is not, however, drawn out at length, the lecturer turning aside to consider the meta-physical difficulties involved in reconciling the freedom of man's will with the omnipotence and omniscience of God. Finally he considers briefly, but skilfully, three popular objections brought against Christianity as inconsistent with

Divine
partia
of eve

W
sketch
the gr
gation
lines.
of life,
God.
ledged
is the
finally
eviden
inexpl
cludes,

'Th
is seen
if conti
every C

ART.

1. *Petr*
of
M
2. *Corp*
M
3. *Pro*
(B

It has
on the
the Gre
even so
their as
tenor o
Council
their p
privilege

Divine love, on the ground of exclusiveness, on the ground of partiality, and on the ground of the inculcation of the doctrine of everlasting punishment.

We have attempted no more than to give a very brief sketch of what is itself a very brief sketch of a great, perhaps the greatest of all subjects. It will be seen that the investigation, so far as it goes, is conducted on strictly scientific lines. It takes nothing for granted except the ordinary facts of life, and the first theorem of all theology—the existence of God. It adopts the hypothesis that that which is acknowledged on all hands to be best and highest in human nature is the first principle in the nature which is divine. And it finally shows that this hypothesis explains facts, agrees with evidence, and throws light on difficulties often abandoned as inexplicable. We may, in fact, conclude, as the Bishop concludes, in a sentence which has our heartiest concurrence :

‘The one truth that God is love, not only, when rightly understood, is seen to be the source of all the doctrines of Christianity, but also, if continually present to our mind, will teach and enable us to apply every Christian doctrine in its true proportion and relation.’

ART. XI.—THE LEGAL FLAWS IN THE LATER PAPACY.

1. *Petri Privilegium*. Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese of Westminster. By HENRY EDWARD MANNING, D.D. (London, 1875.)
2. *Corpus Juris Canonici*. Edid. P. & F. PITHÆUS. (Coloniæ Munatianæ, 1779.)
3. *Prompta Bibliotheca Canonica*, a LUCIO FERRARIS. (Bononiæ, 1758.)

IT has been sufficiently shown, in former papers of this series on the Petrine claims, that down to the pontificate of Gregory the Great it had proved impossible for the Popes to establish even so much as legal prescription in the very West itself for their asserted sovereignty over Christendom ; while the whole tenor of Church history, specially as regards the General Councils, proves to demonstration that they could never get their possession of a Divine and imprescriptible charter of privilege acknowledged anywhere by entire Churches, per-

sistently as they pressed it from the time of Leo the Great, and often as they seemed on the point of success. But the Papacy which Gregory bequeathed to his successors was a far more powerful factor in Christendom than that which he inherited had been. From the seventh till the fifteenth century Rome is as truly the centre of European policy in the civil, as well as in the religious, sphere as it had been when still the seat of the Empire of the Cæsars; and the newer theory of its right to govern the nations of the world, or at the least to be looked up to by them as the most august and authoritative spot upon the earth, bade fair to be as influential as that memory of universal rule which went for so much in generating the original sovereign claim of the Pope, less as the alleged successor of S. Peter than as the chief personage in the acknowledged conqueror and capital of the world.

It is unnecessary to follow the course of the fortunes of the Roman See henceforth in the almost unbroken fashion required for the earlier stages of this inquiry, and it will suffice to state broadly that the authority of the Popes grew steadily greater as it became more concentrated in the West, and as intercourse with the East became rarer and more difficult, till, after being advanced even further by the genius and daring of Nicolas I., Gregory VII., and Innocent III., it culminated in the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII., which claims universal sovereignty as a *de fide* right of the Roman Pontiff. One very noticeable factor in the increasing veneration for Rome itself as the Holy City was the falling off of pilgrimages to Jerusalem, enormously as the cost and toil of the journey, and its dangers also, were increased by the political changes of the times. The city which could boast of the tombs of the two chief Apostles naturally succeeded to the virtually vacant place of honour and devotion, and became the goal of devout visitors, to so marked a degree that its very name has entered integrally into the words which signify 'pilgrim' and 'pilgrimage' in several Romance languages, such as the Spanish *romero* and *romeria*, the Portuguese *romeiro*, the Italian *romeo*, the Old French *romipète* and *romieu*. The greater the stress laid on the immense power of the Papacy in mediæval Europe, the higher the claims put forward for the dignity and privileges of the Apostolic See, the weightier are all counterbalancing facts, the more fatal all interruptions of the new prescription. And there is a yet graver consideration than all others behind. Let us assume for a moment, though in the teeth of all Scripture and history, that the doctrine of the Petrine privilege is true, that S. Peter was given infallibility

and so
that he
feasibly
of the I
tians, th
the 'liv
Even so
these au
facto.
title Cæ
the thro
cessful
tain him
unimpe
moment
doctrine
Roman
French
dynasty
does occ
is an ax
possessi
all acts
Pope d
course,
the qual
Cardina
compet
his succ
clergy a
majority
canonic
eye of t
virtue o
College
whole c
Pope.
are, wh
not of
have no
the Pap
And th
ascertai
doubt a
claiman

and sovereign jurisdiction over the whole Church Catholic, that he was Pope of Rome, and conveyed his privileges indefinitely to the Popes who succeeded him, that the Successor of the Fisherman is the supreme ruler and teacher of Christians, the one Vicar of Christ on earth, whose single word is the 'living voice of the Church,' infallible and paramount. Even so, something further is essential: the Pope who claims these august prerogatives must be Pope *de jure* as well as *de facto*. Under the Roman Empire it did not matter by what title Cæsar wore the purple, whether he had made his way to the throne of the world by inheritance, by election, by successful rebellion, or by murder. So long as he could maintain himself on his dangerous throne, his legal rights were unimpeachable, his acts were all civilly valid, but not for a moment longer. Nothing in the least resembling the later doctrine of the Divine right of kings meets us in the whole of Roman imperial history, no parallel to English Jacobitism or French Legitimism can be found after the overthrow of any dynasty, even when such a regular transmission of the empire does occur for a while, as a dynasty implies. Contrariwise, it is an axiom of Latin theology and canon law that unlawful possession of the Papacy confers no rights whatever, and that all acts done by one who is Pope *de facto* without being also Pope *de jure* are null and void. This nullity extends, of course, to the institution of all beneficiaries within the area of the quasi-Pope's domestic jurisdiction, and to the creations of Cardinals. That is to say, a false Pope may seriously affect the competency of the electoral body which will have to choose his successor. When the choice of the Popes lay with the clergy and people of the City of Rome, it is plain that if the majority of the clergy at any given time had not been canonically instituted, they were not competent electors in the eye of the law, and their nominee could acquire no rights in virtue of their votes. This is even plainer in the case of the College of Cardinals, as being composed of persons whose whole claim to their rank rests on their nomination by the Pope. They are not specially ordained, as bishops and priests are, who may be possessed of perfectly valid orders, though not of legal right to a particular benefice or See, and they have no shadow of claim, to the red hat or to the electorate for the Papacy, unless the Pope who named them had full powers. And that is not by any means a matter at once satisfactorily ascertainable, for another maxim of Latin theology is that any doubt as to the rightful tenure of the Papal chair by any claimant is to be ruled against him, not for him, as is laid*

down expressly by Bellarmine, who says: 'Dubius Papa habetur pro non-Papa.'¹ This includes all cases of disputed elections, whenever there is not full proof of the validity of the election of the particular claimant who ultimately prevailed; for the mere fact of his having prevailed does not settle this preliminary question, as it is not pretended that the electors were infallible judges of that issue.² The cases of absolute nullity, admitting of no dispute, are these: Intrusion by some external influence, without any election by the constituency; election by those only who are not qualified to elect; simony; and antecedent personal ineligibility of certain definite kinds. The cases of highly probable nullity are those of heresy, whether manifest or secret, and whether previous to or after election to the Papacy.³ A few citations in proof of these positions must be set down in order to show that they are accepted principles of the Roman canon law, and not arbitrary cavils of hostile controversialists. The species of irregularity arising from some purely personal disqualification may be left out of account, because in point of fact its stringency has been so much impaired by incessant dispensations that it can scarcely be appealed to as admittedly effective; though it may be remarked that, as a dispensation from irregularity must always come from an authority superior to that of the irregular candidate for promotion to any ecclesiastical grade, and some forms of irregularity can be dispensed from by the Pope alone, it follows that where it is the Papacy itself which is vacant and to be filled, there can be no power lodged anywhere in the Roman Church to make an otherwise disqualified candidate eligible for that particular piece of promotion; for the College of Cardinals, though they enter upon the government of the Roman Church during the interval between the death of one Pope and the election of his successor, do not hold his prerogatives in commission, and cannot perform singly or conjointly any specifically Papal acts, as, for instance,

¹ *De Concil.* lib. ii. cap. 19, sect. xix.

² The mere fact of an anti-Pope claiming the Papacy does not make the title of the acknowledged Pope uncertain, but only when a reasonable doubt arises as to which candidate has been lawfully elected. What the thirty-nine anti-Popes who claimed the Papacy even before the inextricable confusion of the Great Schism do prove is that no Church is so lacking in the note of Unity as the local Roman Church. It has been the typical home of schism.

³ Highly probable only, and not absolute; because, as the citations show, while there is a consensus of theologians and canonists on the subject, there is no express decree of canon law to the same effect.

the cre
episcopa
Pope's g

First
is govern
in the c
1059: '4
a cleric
vinciali
The La
explain
Roman
dischar
the Cou
been fo
by the
without
there is
Apost
lium e
religios
Apost
these u
legislat
do not
the Pap
down in

It fo
that no
Popes c
unless
supera
but a la
the who
been c
election
tenure.

Nor
this cla
forcible
voids it
ficii per
jure.'²

the creation of cardinals or bishops, the confirmation of episcopal elections, or even the collation to benefices in the Pope's gift.¹

First, then, as to the question of forcible intrusion. This is governed by a maxim of Leo the Great, formally embodied in the canon law by the Lateran Council under Nicolas II. in 1059: 'Nulla ratio sinit ut inter episcopos habeantur, qui nec a clericis sunt electi, nec a plebibus expetiti, nec a comprovincialibus episcopis cum metropolitani judicio consecrati.' The Lateran Council applies this to the case of the Papacy, explaining that, as there is no metropolitan superior over the Roman Church, the cardinal bishops are to be accounted as discharging that function in the election. The case before the Council was that of John, Bishop of Velletri, who had been forcibly imposed as Pope under the name of Benedict X. by the Count of Tusculum, on the death of Stephen X., without any election by the Roman clergy and people. And there is a decree of Nicolas II. cited by Gratian: 'Si quis Apostolicæ Sedi sine concordii et canonica electione Cardinalium ejusdem ecclesiæ, ac deinde sequentium clericorum religiosorum, inthronizatur; non Papa vel Apostolicus, sed Apostaticus habeatur.' Of course, in a matter of the sort, these utterances must be taken as declaratory, not less than legislative; as retrospective, not less than prospective. They do not limit themselves to enacting that certain accessions to the Papacy shall be treated as void for the future, but lay down in general terms that they are inherently void.

It follows as a necessary corollary from these premisses that none of the clergy appointed to benefices by such titular Popes can acquire electoral rights in virtue of such institution, unless some act of indemnity by a competent authority be superadded; but from the nature of the case, no authority but a lawfully elected Pope is competent, and if at any time the whole clerical electorate, or a working majority of it, has been canonically vitiated, there could be no lawful after-election made, and no subsequent validation of the irregular tenure.

Nor is intrusion from without the only form of nullity in this class. It is a maxim of the canon law that violent and forcible entrance upon a benefice, though lawfully acquired, voids it: 'Per violentam ingressione in possessionem beneficii perdit quis eo ipso jus, quod ad illud habet, et vacat ipso jure.'² This principle exactly applies to the celebrated case

¹ Ferraris, *Bibl. Canon.* s. v. 'Cardinalis.'

² *Ibid.* s. v. 'Beneficium,' vii. 20.

of the disputed election in A.D. 366, between Damasus and Ursicinus. We do not know, and are never likely to know, which of the two was canonically elected, if either; and it was Court influence, not any synodical finding, which decided the matter in favour of Damasus, whom the partisans of Ursicinus never acknowledged as lawful Pope. But it is certain that Damasus entered on his office by means of violent rioting and homicide, and that twice over, and thereby forfeited the very doubtful right he had acquired by an election posterior to that of Ursicinus.¹ And there are parallel cases later in the history of the Roman See.

Next comes the nullity due to simony. It is known to us from the epistles of S. Jerome that greed of money was a crying sin of the Roman clergy even in his day, so that it had to be dealt with by the civil law; and though the form their covetousness took then was that of endeavouring to extort deeds of gift and rich legacies from wealthy lay-folk, it was not long before simony became habitual, so that the civil power was obliged to interfere with enactments to check the notorious abuses attending every episcopal election, and above all, that to the Papal chair itself. We have given proof of this fact elsewhere, and need not repeat it.² But a few citations of spiritual decrees on the subject will be pertinent.

(a.) 'If any Bishop, or Priest, or Deacon obtains this rank by money, let him be deposed, and his ordainer also, and be altogether cut off from communion, as Simon Magus was by Peter.'³

(b.) 'If any Bishop should ordain for money, and put to sale a grace which cannot be sold . . . let him who is convicted of this forfeit his own rank; and let him who is ordained get no advantage from the purchased ordination or promotion, but let him be expelled from the dignity or cure which he procured for money. And if anyone act as go-between in such scandalous and illegal transactions, if he be a cleric, let him be degraded from his rank.'⁴

(c.) 'Every Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, convicted of giving or receiving ordination for money, falls from the Priesthood.'⁵

(d.) 'All crimes are accounted as nothing in comparison with the simoniacal heresy.'⁶

'Ordinations performed for money . . . we decide to be null and void.'⁷

¹ *Marcellini et Faustini Libellus*, inter opp. Sirmondi, vol. i.

² 'The Papal Monarchy in the Sixth Century,' *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1882, p. 101.

³ *Can. Apost.* xxx.

⁴ *Conc. Chalced.* can. ii.

⁵ *Conc. II. Nicæn. Epist. Tarasii Patriarch.*

⁶ *Paschalis Papa*, apud Gratian, causa i. qu. 7.

⁷ *Can. v. of Roman Synod under Gregory VII.* in 1078.

(e.) 'judicial s
ignorant
proceede
person si
absolution

(f.) 'Leo IV.,
the order
and irrepe

Here
and in
before hi
formal d
flaw are

(a.) 'excommu
Pope or K

(b.) 'is not Pop

(c.) 'Pope ther
a member

As a
case, imp
intellectu
believe),
Papa' in
S. Bonifa
theologia
Pope, how
is one ca

(d.) 'because h
unless he

And, apa
vide for i
the great
pended b

¹ Ferrar

² Van M

³ S. Ra

⁴ S. Au

⁵ Bellar

(e.) 'All simoniacal elections are void, even without any formal judicial sentence, and though the elected person may be wholly ignorant of the facts : unless it can be shown that the simony has proceeded from an enemy, in order to damage him. And every person simoniacally elected is bound to resign, and cannot obtain absolution till he has done so.'¹

(f.) 'And, finally, the more accredited opinion, that of Pope Leo IV., is that even penitence does not avail for the recognition of the orders of simoniacal clerks, but that their deposition is perpetual and irreparable.'²

Heresy is the last form of nullity which we need consider ; and in respect of the Pope may take three shapes : heresy before his election, heresy after his election, and heresy in the formal definition of doctrine. The rules which govern this flaw are as follow :—

(a.) 'Every heretic, whether secret or manifest, incurs the greater excommunication, and also deposition, whether he be cleric or laic, Pope or Emperor.'³

(b.) 'As a dead man is not a man, so a Pope detected in heresy is not Pope ; because he is *ipso facto* deposed.'⁴

(c.) 'The fifth opinion is therefore true, that a manifestly heretical Pope thereby ceases to be Pope, as he ceases to be a Christian, and a member of the body of the Church.'⁵

As against the cavil that this is a purely hypothetical case, impossible of occurrence, and put forward only as an intellectual speculation (which Bellarmine would have us believe), stands the saving clause in the celebrated canon, 'Si Papa' in the Decretum of Gratian, taken from the writings of S. Boniface of Mentz (the most papalising of early mediæval theologians), and claiming general irresponsibility for the Pope, however culpable in his acts. It lays down that there is one case in which the Pope may be called to account :

(d.) 'In this event let no mortal presume to censure his faults, because he who is empowered to judge all is to be judged by none, unless he be detected erring from the faith.'⁶

And, apart from the obvious fact that dry law does not provide for impossible cases, here is the significant comment of the greatest of all the mediæval Popes, Innocent III., appended by Pithou in his edition of the *Corpus Juris Canonici* :

¹ Ferraris, *Bibl. Canon.* s. v. 'Simonia,' art. ii.

² Van Espen, *Jus Eccl.* part. ii. sect. iii. tit. xiii. cap. 6.

³ S. Raymond de Peñaforte, *Summa, Lit. de Hæres.*

⁴ S. Augustin. Anconitan. *Summa*, qu. 5.

⁵ Bellarmine, *De Rom. Pont.* ii. 30.

⁶ *Decret.* I. xl. 6.

(e.) 'Faith is so especially necessary for me, in that while I have God as my Judge for other sins, I can be judged by the Church for that sin only which is committed against the Faith.'¹

Other canonists and divines who have laid down that heresy forfeits all Papal rank and privileges are Ulrich of Strasburg, Hugo of Ferrara, Peter de Palude (Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem), Johannes Andreae, William of Ockham, Antonio de Rosellis, and Cardinal Turrecremata.² It is to be noted, moreover, that no saving clause occurs in any of these decisions to the effect that a Pope who repents of his heresy, and retracts it, is thereby reinstated without further process. They speak of the fall from the Popedom as final and irreversible. All these, however, touch only the question of heresy after reaching the Papal chair. But the formidable Bull of Paul IV., *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, promulgated in 1559, takes a yet wider sweep, and imports a fresh element of uncertainty, in addition to the doubt whether the Pope at any given time may not be a secret heretic, and so a mere delusive simulacrum, all whose acts are inherently null. It runs thus:—

(f.) 'Adding that if it should at any time appear that any Bishop, even ranking as Archbishop, or Patriarch, or Primate, or Cardinal of the aforesaid Roman Church, or even, as already stated, Legate, or even the Roman Pontiff himself, previous to his promotion as Cardinal, or his election to be Roman Pontiff, has deviated from the Catholic Faith, or fallen into any heresy, his promotion, or his election, even if by full agreement, and made by the unanimous assent of all the Cardinals, shall be null, void, and ineffective, nor shall it be capable of being styled or becoming valid or legitimate in any respect, in virtue of entrance on office, consecration, subsequent possession of authority and governing power, enthronement or homage as Roman Pontiff, or obedience paid to him in that character by all persons.'

A further clause absolves all persons who have taken part in the election of any once erring, heretical, or schismatic person as Pope, from every oath and pledge of obedience they may have taken to him or to any others coming within purview of the Bull, directing them, contrariwise, to treat them as magicians, heathens, publicans, and heresiarchs, and to invoke the aid of the secular arm against them, and in favour of canonical

¹ *Serm. 2 de Consecrat. Pontif.*

² See the citations in Renouf's *Condemnation of Pope Honorius*; and the admission of F. Ryder, that such has been a very common opinion held by very Roman theologians, 'and that if a Pope could define heresy, in so defining, he would un-Pope himself.'—*Contemporary Review*, Feb. 1879, p. 471.

claimant
such ac

Alth
characte
after its
For it e
Paul IV
attache
would b
or that
office as
disquali
faith be
antedced
receiving
ante-bay
The Pa
to be se
electors.
is enoug
Ultram
for doin
is Pope

Exa
cited in
more th
Vigilius
forth.
complet
the Rom
have aff
they do
tinuity
historica
contend
looked o
interreg
restored
appointe
dormant
strength
pointed,
been no
thousan

Pers

claimants, without incurring any censures or penalties for such action.

Although this remarkable document has no retrospective character, and applies in its legal bearing only to cases arising after its publication, it has a far wider theological sweep. For it establishes as incontestable these two propositions, that Paul IV. and the thirty-two Cardinals whose signatures are attached to the Bull, did not hold either that the Cardinals would be divinely guarded against making an invalid election, or that any such grace is inseparably bound up with the Papal office as to confer fitness and eligibility upon an otherwise disqualified candidate. And yet, if infallibility in matters of faith be an unvarying attribute of the Papacy, it is clear that antecedent and retracted error can be no more an obstacle to receiving that grace on election and consecration, than repented ante-baptismal sin is a bar to remission of sins in baptism. The Papal office and the Petrine privilege are thus asserted to be separable; and as secret heresy, unknown to all the electors, and perhaps even forgotten by the candidate himself, is enough to disqualify, it follows that there is no warrant, on Ultramontane principles, for a valid election at any time, or for doing more than hope that the actual wearer of the tiara is Pope at all.

Examples of nullity of all these various kinds have been cited in preceding papers of this series—disputed elections more than once, intrusion and simony together in the case of Vigilius, heresy in those of Liberius and Zozimus, and so forth. But however serious these were as they occurred, and completely as they demonstrate that no Divine exemption of the Roman Chair from the moral and legal vicissitudes which have affected other less eminent Sees has been vouchsafed, they do not amount necessarily to entire solution of continuity in the Petrine succession, assuming that to be an historical and theological fact. It is always possible to contend that the intruded or self-deposed Popes must be looked on as simple blanks in the series, and their reigns as interregna, but that the normal condition of things was restored upon the next valid election, and that the canonically appointed Pope entered at once on the exercise of the lately dormant and now revived privilege of Peter. But the whole strength of this defence lies in the words 'canonically appointed,' and it will be established presently that there has been no canonical election to the Papacy probable for a thousand years past, or possible for about four hundred.

Personal depravity in a Pope, however gross and notorious,

and though amongst the grounds which have several times justified depositions from the Papacy, is not in itself a cause of legal nullity. But its frequency¹ and enormity is a moral argument of the weightiest kind against that form of Ultramontaniam which makes the Roman See, and indeed the Pope singly, to be the whole Church in microcosm, or rather the energizing soul and vital principle of the Church. For it proves that the mark of Holiness, one of the Five Notes of the Church, has been conspicuously absent from the Church of Rome.

The first signal disproof of the Papal claims in the period with which we are now to deal is the reply of Dinoth, Abbat of Bangor-Iscoed, at the Synod of S. Augustine's Oak in 603 (a few months before the death of Gregory the Great), to the Roman missionaries who claimed the obedience of the British Churches in virtue of the Papal appointment of S. Augustine as Metropolitan :—

'Be it known to you, without any ambiguity, that we all and singly are obedient to the Pope of Rome and to every true and devout Christian, to love each in his own order with perfect charity, and to aid each one of them to become sons of God in word and deed. And I know not any other obedience than this due to him whom ye style Pope, nor that he has a claim and right to be Father of fathers. And the aforesaid obedience we are ready to yield at once to him and to every Christian. Further, we are under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Caerleon-on-Usk, who is, under God, appointed to oversee us, and to make us keep the spiritual path.'²

This remarkable speech goes even further than denial of the special supremacy claimed by the Popes over all Christendom, for it proves that they were not held to possess so much as Patriarchal rights over the entire West. And its value as a legal statement is enhanced by the absence of what would certainly have been forthcoming at a later date, namely, denunciation of such independence as heretical. S. Augustine of Canterbury, undoubted as is his piety, was not a man of large sympathy or broad mind; but was both narrow and intolerant of diversity from the customs in which he had been reared. Nevertheless, the only points of deviation between

¹ Gilbert Genebrard, Archbishop of Aix (1537-1597), in his *Chronologia Sacra*, sæc. x. iv. (Cologne, 1571), alleges that fifty Popes in a hundred and fifty years—that is, nearly one-fifth of the total number till the present time—were apostates rather than apostolic, and Baronius (*Ann.* 897) is no milder in his language.

² Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, vol. i. p. 123.

British
enforc
Easter
fact tha
trinally
ine's ter
have fa
Divinely
front of
that pla
remark
of Whit
he argu
local pe
alleged,
and as
the Ap
nuously
the inhe
Christer
tradition
reckonin

But
Papal o
heresy
the acti
condem
we did
proceed

The
of the s
due to a
termino
return t
was Ser
seem, b
sixty ye
it was s
energy o
Bishop
Sergius
Heracliu

³ Bede
³ 'The
Review, A

British and Roman usage upon which he endeavoured to enforce conformity to the latter were the computation of Easter and the ceremonial of baptism.¹ It is clear from this fact that then even at Rome itself it was not yet ruled doctrinally that denial of the Papal claims is heresy, for Augustine's temper makes it certain that otherwise he would not have failed to put the charge of disobedience towards the Divinely privileged Head of the Catholic Church in the forefront of British sins against that Church, instead of giving that place to the mode of reckoning Easter. And the same remark holds good even of S. Wilfrid's language at the Council of Whitby in 664, impassionedly Roman as it was, for though he argued against the British computation of Easter as a mere local peculiarity, contrary to Catholic usage; as not being, as alleged, conformable to the practice of the Apostle S. John; and as opposed, in particular, to that of S. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, which he believed and asserted to be continuously observed in Rome; yet he rested his case not on the inherent right of the Pope to settle such matters for all Christendom, but on the supposed historical fact of unbroken tradition in Rome from S. Peter as to the true method of reckoning.²

But the leading case in the seventh century against the Papal claims is undoubtedly the *ex cathedra* definition of heresy by Pope Honorius I. We have already referred to the action of the Sixth General Council in formulating his condemnation, and to its reiteration for many centuries;³ but we did not prove the truth of the charge, which we will now proceed to do.

The Monothelite heresy, which first appears at the outset of the seventh century, is a sub-form of Monophysism, and is due to a well-meaning, but unwise, attempt to find some new terminology whereby the Monophysites might be induced to return to Catholic communion. The author of this attempt was Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, misled, it would seem, by a letter ascribed to his predecessor Mennas, about sixty years previous, and addressed to Pope Vigilius, in which it was said that our Lord had 'one will and one life-giving energy or operation.' He referred the expression to Theodore, Bishop of Pharan, who accepted it as orthodox, whereupon Sergius formally adopted it. Some years later, the Emperor Heraclius, desirous of ending the Monophysite controversy,

¹ Bæda, *H. E.* ii. 2.

² *Ibid.* iii. 25.

³ 'The Petrine Claims at the Bar of History,' *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1879, pp. 17-20.

which was politically dangerous to the Empire, conceived the plan of conciliating the Monophysites by means of Monothelite explanations (to be offered by the Catholics), of the sense to be put on the ascription of two natures to Christ. He consulted Cyrus, Bishop of Phasis, on the matter, and he in turn laid it before the Patriarch Sergius, whose reply was that the question of one or two operations had never been formally decided, but that various eminent Fathers had spoken of one operation only. This answer convinced Cyrus, who soon after became Patriarch of Alexandria, and committed himself publicly to Monothelism. The opposite side was maintained by S. Sophronius, who became Patriarch of Jerusalem in 633, and who had shortly before endeavoured to dissuade Cyrus from the course he was taking, and finding that impossible, went to Constantinople to consult Sergius, not knowing him to be the real author of the trouble; but could get no better terms from him than a promise to let the controversy drop on both sides. But when S. Sophronius achieved his high rank, Sergius, feeling alarm at the influence he might exercise, wrote a long letter to Pope Honorius, setting forth his view of the controversy, and asking him to give his adhesion to himself and Cyrus, and against Sophronius. Thus the matter was public and official in the highest degree, being virtually an appeal from three out of the five Patriarchates to a fourth, and that the highest in dignity, to pronounce on a most serious theological controversy, wherein the whole reality of the Atonement was involved.

In the reply which Honorius sent, he committed himself definitely to the cardinal doctrine of Monothelism, saying, 'We confess ONE WILL of our Lord Jesus Christ.'¹ And he added, near the close of his letter, these further words, 'These things your fraternity will preach with us, as we preach them in unanimity with you ;'² thereby making common cause with Sergius, and identifying himself with his teaching. He replied as Pope, declaring what should be the teaching in the Western Church so far as he was concerned, and specifying that the same teaching ought to be followed in the East also. Accordingly, his Letters were dogmatic *ex cathedra* decrees, and were explicitly heretical, being in fact not only appealed to by the Monothelites for half a century afterwards as their mainstay, but also forming the groundwork of the *Ecthesis* of the Emperor Heraclius, which embodied the crucial phrase

¹ 'Unde et *unam voluntatem* fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi.'

² 'Hæc nobiscum fraternitas vestra prædicet, sicut et nos ea vobiscum unanimiter prædicamus' (Hefele, *Conciliengesch.*, b. vi. Append.).

already
Martin
pressy
were c
to be b
in eccle
vii. 978

Ult
knowle
what F
defence
from s
enough
being i
compet
epistles
it will
Hefe
entirely

But
equally
view be
doxy is
necessa
the Ro
in 787
by Pap
Hadria
jected
the Gr
name a
supiner
him, w
Honor
stantin

¹ Fu
in Hefe
and the
analysis
address
in P. G
Renouf
nori
² M

1870.
³ 'D
thodox
VOL

already cited, and was condemned as 'most impious' by Pope Martin I. in the First Council of Lateran in 649. It was expressly as 'dogmatic epistles' that the letters of Honorius were condemned by the Sixth General Council, and ordered to be burnt as profane and hurtful to souls—the first example in ecclesiastical history of this kind of sentence (Labbe, *Conc.* vii. 978, 1006).¹

Ultramontane writers, either from having no sufficient knowledge of theology, or from a fixed determination to use what F. Gratry does not hesitate to qualify as 'falsehoods' in defence of the figment of Papal infallibility, have not shrunk from saying not merely (with Hefele) what is conceivable enough, that Honorius had no intention of teaching heresy, being in truth neither logician nor theologian, and thus incompetent to meddle in an abstruse controversy, but that his epistles are 'entirely orthodox.'² Against this wild assertion it will suffice to quote part of one sentence from Bishop Hefele: 'The affirmation that the Letters of Honorius are entirely orthodox is false.'³

But the peculiarity of the case of Honorius is that it is equally destructive of the Ultramontane position, whatever view be taken of his theology. To establish his entire orthodoxy is of absolutely no help, because, in order to do so, it is necessary to reject the three General Councils (as counted in the Roman reckoning), of Constantinople in 681, Nicæa II. in 787, and Constantinople in 869, all of them attended by Papal legates, and formally confirmed by Popes Agatho, Hadrian I. and Hadrian II. themselves (instead of being rejected at Rome, as Canon xxvii. of Chalcedon was by Leo the Great), in each of which Honorius was condemned by name as a heretic, and as a fautor of heresy, not for mere supineness. If he was orthodox, then they, in condemning him, were heterodox, as were also Leo II., who condemned Honorius anew thrice over—in a letter to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus; in another to the Spanish Bishops (wherein

¹ Full details of the long controversy here summarized will be found in Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* B. xvi.; and Mr. E. F. Willis's *Pope Honorius and the New Roman Dogma* (London, 1879) presents a convenient analysis of it, as well as a refutation of Pennacchi's apology for Honorius, addressed to the Vatican Council; while separate points are discussed in P. Gratry, *Lettres à Monseigneur Deschamps*, and in Mr. Le Page Renouf's *Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, and *The Case of Pope Honorius Reconsidered* (London: 1868-9).

² Manning, *The Vatican Council and its Definitions*, p. 223. London: 1870.

³ 'Die Behauptung . . . die Briefe des Honorius sind durchaus orthodox . . . ist falsch' (*Conciliengesch.* xvi.).

he asserts the damnation of Honorius, 'Æterna condemnatione mulctati sunt, id est, Theodorus . . . una cum Honorio' (Labbe, *Conc.* vii. 1456); and in a third to Erwiga, King of Spain—and Gregory II., who is believed to have drafted that profession of faith contained in the *Liber Diurnus*, to be made by each Pope at his coronation, wherein Honorius is again specified as a heretic; so that, for the many centuries this profession was made, every Pope had to pledge himself to the assertion that Honorius had been bound by sentence of perpetual anathema, for having added fuel to the execrable and heretical dogma of Sergius and the other Monothelites.¹

There is absolutely no escape from the dilemma of asserting either the heresy of Honorius, as a Pope undertaking to teach the Church Universal by formal dogmatic letters, or the heresy of all those General Councils and Popes which condemned him in the most explicit terms as a heretic. It is this fact of his condemnation, and on such grounds, whether true or false, which is the keystone of the whole matter. The most triumphant demonstration of his orthodoxy would but make matters worse for infallibilism, since, if he was an Athanasius, those other Popes have all fallen like Liberius. The Councils which formulated the several condemnations could not have believed in any tenure of a Petrine privilege which empowers the Popes to teach the Church Universal, and to be Divinely guaranteed from error in doing so.

The next salient example of a flaw in the prescription for the Petrine claims belongs to the ninth century; and, though not of so startling a nature as the condemnation of Honorius, is nevertheless in some respects even more adverse to the theory of Papal sovereignty. For in the case of Honorius it may at least be said that the censures upon him proceeded from no authority inferior to that of General Councils and other Popes; and as the Gallican school has always held the subordination of the Popes to General Councils, while admitting the Papal monarchy so limited, there is room for a modified assertion of some Petrine privilege as annexed to the Papacy, albeit far short of personal infallibility. But the instance now to be cited does not leave room for even so much.

The controversy upon image-worship had been decided in Western Christendom, by the Caroline Books and by the Council of Frankfort, in a sense opposite to that of the Second

¹ 'Auctores vero novi hæretici dogmatis, Sergium . . . una cum Honorio, qui pravis eorum assertionibus fomentum impendit . . . cum omnibus hæreticis scriptis atque sequacibus, nexu perpetui anathematis devinxerunt' (*Liber Diurnus*, ed. De Rozière, pp. 194-201).

Council
the ext
prevent
Michael
vagrant
no right
decision
of Chris
in a let
head of
priests
which t
polluted
sions, w
addressi
same Th
Patriarch
supreme

The
rate, we
embassy
explaining
iconoclas
no expre
to get so
same tim
to undo
the Stud
learned
Eugenius
question
mission
examine
of the C
The Pop
November

This
the lette
behalf of
nation of
sion of re
for them,
rejects hi
charges h

Council of Nicæa. But it was still raging in the East, and the extreme champions of images in Constantinople strove to prevent the question from being reopened by the Emperor Michael II., who desired to abate some of the more extravagant abuses of the cult. They asserted that the State had no right of interference in such matters, and that the ultimate decision rested with the See of Rome, as the supreme Church of Christ on earth, in which Peter sat in the beginning; while in a letter to Pope Paschal I. from Theodore the Studite, head of the party, that Pontiff is styled 'Prince of all the priests of the Lord, supreme pastor of the Church, rock on which the Catholic Church is built, Peter himself, and unpolluted source of Divine truth,' with other kindred expressions, whose value may be appraised by noting that in addressing the Patriarch of Jerusalem for the like purpose, the same Theodore assures him that he is really first of all the Patriarchs, though but fifth in nominal rank, and that the supreme patriarchal dignity must rest in his See.¹

The Emperor, knowing that the Churches of Gaul, at any rate, were not in agreement with the Studite faction, sent an embassy to the Western Emperor, Ludwig the Pious, in 824, explaining his own standpoint as equally removed from the iconoclasm of 754 and the iconolatry of 787 (though he made no express mention of the Synods), and asking his assistance to get some satisfactory compromise arrived at; stating at the same time his intention of sending his envoys to Rome also, to undo the effect of the misrepresentations made there by the Studites. Ludwig consulted his clergy, then the most learned in Europe, and on their advice applied to Pope Eugenius II. to sanction a formal inquiry into the whole question of image-worship, to be conducted by a select commission of the most learned divines in France, who were to examine the Scriptures and the Fathers to ascertain the mind of the Church with a view to a final settlement of the debate. The Pope assented, and the Commission met at Paris in November, 826, sending in its report not very long after.

This remarkable document opens with a formal censure of the letter of Pope Hadrian I. to Constantine and Irene on behalf of image-worship; and, though approving his condemnation of the extreme iconoclasts, blames severely his permission of relative worship to images, his use of the term 'holy' for them, and his ratification of the Nicene canons of 787. It rejects his patristic quotations as irrelevant and misleading, charges him with having given great scandal to the faithful,

¹ Baron. *Ann.* 818, i. ii.; 817, xx.

disparaged the Pontifical dignity, as well as the truth itself, and misunderstood, through sheer ignorance, the teaching of Gregory the Great, to which he appealed in support of his own. They next proceed to deal in the same stringent fashion with the letters of Pope Gregory II.; and soon after add that their inquiries had convinced them of the great practical evils of the 'pestilent superstition' of image-worship, which they viewed with much alarm, especially since the Popes, whose duty it was to keep others in the right path, had themselves strayed far from it. And they recommend the Emperor not to throw the blame of the condition of things on the Pope personally, seeing that there were others who might fairly bear the whole of it, and that without scandal to the Church; while the Pope might be brought to a sounder mind by study of the extracts they had made from the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers, because his See itself is subject to the precepts of Scripture and of the Holy Catholic Fathers, and the Pope himself cannot be styled Universal unless he combats with all his might on behalf of the whole state of the Universal Church.¹

The Emperor Ludwig took no practical action upon the Report, but it remains as a monument of the freedom with which a body of private divines in the ninth century, not even synodically assembled, held themselves at liberty to sit in judgment upon formal Papal utterances. But the accession of a Pope of genius and high character, Nicolas I., a little later in the century (A.D. 858), nearly synchronizing with the appearance of the False Decretals, to which he was the first Pope to appeal in evidence of his claims (though necessarily aware of their fictitious character, as being absent from the Roman archives, where he alleged them to have been long preserved with honour²), more than won back all the influence and prestige which the Roman Chair had formerly enjoyed in the West; while the opportunity afforded in the East by the struggle between the partisans of the rival patriarchs of Constantinople, Ignatius and Photius, together with circumstances which enabled the Pope to interfere in the newly converted kingdom of Bulgaria, gave him no little power in that part of Christendom also. Akin to Leo the Great and Innocent III. in mental vigour and in personal dignity of character, akin to Gregory the Great in love of justice and in administrative capacity, Nicolas I. was without bounds to his ambition for

¹ Baron. *Ann.* 825, vii.-xx.; and more fully in Bouquet, *Hist. de France*, vi. 338-341. The anger of Baronius over this report is amusing.

² Mansi, *Conc.* xv. 695.

the ag
means
tendom
a result
the act
only va
moreov
sphere
only in
allegian
stantinc
religiou
consequ
decay o
of Alex
past, th
for Ro
been tr
claims o
steadily
finally a
vast and
no comp
was rui
irregular
intermit
turies, b
incurabl

The
name of
legate o
two syn
capacity
that he
lay com
from bo
to his S
and som
haps do
a deacon
his soler
into the

¹ The
decided o
only, whe
later time

the aggrandisement of his See, and had no scruples as to the means he employed for making it the supreme arbiter of Christendom alike in the ecclesiastical and the temporal domain, a result he so nearly achieved that he stands out in history as the actual creator of that Papal monarchy which had been only vaguely planned by his most eminent predecessors, who, moreover, had scarcely dreamed of domination in the civil sphere over those sovereigns whose subjects they were, not only in the eye of the secular law, but by their own oath of allegiance at each accession to the Papacy. And as Constantinople was dwindling steadily in power, both civilly and religiously, from the advance of Islam in the East, and the consequent narrowing of the limits of the empire, and from the decay of Oriental Christianity, making the three Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem mere shadows of their past, there was no possible rival, or even effectual check, left for Rome to fear. Had the tenet of the Petrine Privilege been true, we should find the long resistance to the Papal claims ended thenceforth, and the truth of all the contentions steadily put forward by the Popes from the time of Anastatius I. finally acknowledged. But the purely human nature of the vast and imposing edifice is disclosed by the fact that, when no competitor or restrainer was any more to be looked for, it was ruined as a tenable theory by internal dissensions and irregularities in Rome itself. Such local disturbances had been intermittent, it is true, in the Roman Church for several centuries, but the evils were never sufficiently long-seated to be incurable. Not so in the period we have now to consider.

The first episode of importance is that connected with the name of Pope Formosus. He had been Bishop of Portus, and legate of Nicolas I. in Bulgaria, and was excommunicated by two synods under John VIII. for alleged misconduct in that capacity, as well as for other offences, and compelled to swear that he would never return to Rome, nor aspire to more than lay communion. The next Pope, Marinus, absolved him from both the excommunication and the oath, restoring him to his See, though still prohibiting his access to Rome itself; and some years later Formosus was elected Pope, though perhaps doubtfully, if a prior election had already chosen Sergius, a deacon of the Roman Church, who was at the altar awaiting his solemn inauguration when the party of Formosus broke into the church and forced him away.¹ Formosus was then

¹ There is no doubt that this did happen to Sergius. But the undecided questions are whether it happened once or twice; and if once only, whether his successful competitor was Formosus, or John IX. at a later time.

consecrated Pope, and held the dignity for five years. His next successor, Boniface VII., sat but fifteen days, and was followed in the Papacy by Stephen VI. He caused the corpse of Formosus to be disinterred¹, dressed in the pontifical robes, and put on trial before a synod for the alleged crime of usurping the Papedom, being canonically ineligible, as already Bishop of Portus, and being the first bishop ever translated to the Papal Chair. He was condemned, stripped of his robes, three fingers cut from his hand, the mutilated corpse was flung into the Tiber, and all his ordinations were declared null and void. A rising against Stephen proved successful a few months later, and he was strangled in prison. His successor, Romanus, is said by Platina to have annulled all his acts,¹ but though this is somewhat doubtful, there is no question that Theodore II., who came next, during his short reign of three weeks reversed all the proceedings against Formosus, declared all his ordinations and other acts legal and valid, and caused his body to be buried in the Vatican. John IX., the next Pope, was not content with this measure of atonement to the memory of Formosus, but convened a synod which formally annulled the acts of that held under Stephen VI., and ordered them to be burnt, while all the ecclesiastics who had taken part in it were obliged to confess themselves guilty, and plead for pardon. There is a doubt whether this was not all reversed again, and the body of Formosus once more disinterred under Sergius III., a Pope of the opposite faction, but, on the whole, it is more probable that Sergius was the chief agent employed by Stephen VI. in the original outrage, long before his own accession to the Papacy.² The importance of this series of events is in showing how completely the Church of Rome was divided against itself, and in what direct contradiction its successive Popes and synods found themselves, at the close of the ninth century, thus preparing the way for the more fatal proceedings which soon followed. In 903,

¹ The words Platina adds to this statement are important: 'Nil enim aliud hi pontificuli cogitabant, quam et nomen et dignitatem majorum suorum extinguere'—a charge identical with that made by Baronius against the pseudo-Popes of the Pornocracy (*Ann.* 908, iii.).

² Auxilius, the contemporary writer who tells us of the annulling and repetition of orders at this time (*ordinatio, exordinatio, et superordinatio*), says that if Stephen and Sergius were right, there had been a break of twenty years in the continuity of the Christian religion and sacraments in Italy, and that nothing short of a General Council could clear up the doubt as to the bishops and priests concerned (*De Ordinatio. Formosi*, capp. xxviii. xl. apud Mabillon, *Vetere Analecta*, pp. 37, 39, Paris 1723). But no such Council ever investigated the matter, and the dogmatic confusion of Rome at this time has never been cured.

Christ
Leo V
prison
turn o
himse
black
certai
courte
ence v
crown
to the
Steph
Agape
the ti
crimes
This
pontif
by sul
undo
same
dignit
the pr
is that
proved
have h
the los

But
one; r
existed
ably a
years,
the Pa
to any
them
certain
single
one co
even if
Leo V
Pope)
in due
of inde
leaving

¹ Ba
referenc

Christopher, a priest of the Roman Church, rose against Pope Leo V., a few weeks after his enthronement, threw him into prison, and intruded himself into the Papacy. He was in his turn overthrown and imprisoned by Sergius III., who intruded himself similarly, and whose character is painted in the blackest colours by the chroniclers of the time. It is at least certain that it was under his auspices that the infamous triad of courtesans, the two Theodoras and Marozia, obtained the influence which enabled them to dispose several times of the Papal crown. They, or Alberic of Spoleto, son of Marozia, nominated to the Papacy Anastatius III., Lando, John X., Leo VI., Stephen VII., John XI., Leo VII., Stephen VIII., Martin III., Agapetus II., and John XII., the last of whom, a mere boy at the time of his intrusion, was deposed for various atrocious crimes by a synod convened by the Emperor Otto I. in 963. This whole series, as Baronius declares, consisted of false pontiffs, having no right to their office, either by election or by subsequent assent of the electors, each of them eager to undo the acts of his predecessors, and choosing persons of the same evil stamp as themselves for the cardinalate and other dignities. And the conclusion he most cleverly draws from the premisses, which he is far from concealing or minimizing, is that the Divine favour and protection were conspicuously proved by the absence of any schism, when a schism would have had so much to assist it, and by the speedy recovery of the lost position.¹

But the conclusion a canonist must draw is a very different one; namely, that if any Petrine succession or privilege ever existed in the Roman Church, it was extinguished irrecoverably at the close of this period; for it extended over sixty years, during which not one lawfully elected Pope ascended the Papal Chair. None of them could canonically appoint to any dignity or benefice in the Roman Church; many of them are known to have sold them. Consequently, it is certain that at the close of the sixty years' anarchy, not one single clerical elector in Rome was qualified to vote, for not one could show a just title to his position; and the lay vote, even if it was given at all, was invalid by itself. The election of Leo VIII. or of Benedict V. (whichever be accounted the true Pope) in 963, was, therefore, void also; for even if conducted in due form, the clerical voters had no status. And as no act of indemnity was ever passed by any authority whatsoever—leaving out of account the very difficult problem of deciding

¹ Baron. *Ann.* 897, iv.; 908, vi. vii.; 912, viii.—especially this last reference.

what authority would have been competent for the purpose—the defect has been incurable. It is precisely analogous to a break of two generations of established bastardy in a pedigree by which it is sought to make good a claim to a peerage. Failing the production of some collateral heir (impossible in the case before us), there is no choice but to declare the family honours extinct. The Petrine line, if ever a reality, ended in the tenth century. The Popes may just conceivably have been Bishops of Rome in some canonical sense for a few centuries longer, though that is made highly improbable by causes yet to be set down; but if so, they had no more connexion with the older line than the Napoleonic dynasty has with the Caroling emperors.

A second series of intruding Popes, who secured their throne by simony, meets us in the eleventh century; Benedict VIII., John XIX., Benedict IX., and Gregory VI., the last of whom was withstood by Benedict and two other anti-Popes, and was deposed for simony in the Council of Sutri in 1046, thus making another canonical vacancy of thirty-four years in the Papacy, enough to throw the gravest doubt on the status of the Roman electorate (even if the former gap of sixty years had not occurred) when Clement II. was elected in 1046; for it is not probable that more than a very small minority of the voting clergy could have held their appointments from a date earlier than the simoniacal intrusion of Benedict VIII. in 1012. And the statement of Bonizo, Bishop of Sutri, about thirty years later,¹ is that the Germans charged the local Roman clergy with being, almost to a man, either illiterate, simoniac, or immoral, while the second (for legal purposes the most serious) count of this indictment is amply borne out by the admissions made at the Synod of Rome in 1047, wherein a vain attempt was made to check this crime,² and by the indignant language of Pope Victor III. while still Abbot of Monte Cassino.³

In 1059 a great innovation on the mode of electing the Popes was introduced by Nicolas II. in a Synod at Rome, transferring the right of voting to the College of Cardinals, instead of the clergy and people of Rome, and Alexander III. in 1179 enacted a canon that any election made by two-thirds of the cardinals should be valid. Nevertheless, it was not till the election of Lucius III. in 1181, that the new regu-

¹ Ætelius, *Rer. Boic. Script.* ii. 801.

² S. Petri Damiani *Epist. ad Henric. Ravenn.*

³ Desider. Montis Cass. ap. Muratori, *Rer. Ital. Script.* iv. 396.

lation v
from v

The
good;
often
certain
which
imprac
was no
city of
all the
to giv
fact, s
univers
to the
should
one.
called
for a r
them
licenc
electio
standi
was n
portan

U:
dange
easier
altoge
avoid
mark
The f
Sixte
cealin
Roma
Grego
cent
body
Corsi
title
on the

¹ M
² T
the M

lation was carried out so as to exclude the old constituency from voting.¹

The motives for the change seem to have been all good; to avoid the rioting and venality which had too often discredited popular elections in Rome; to insure certainty as to the actual result of the voting by a method which made personation and other electioneering artifices impracticable; and above all (now that the dignity of Cardinal was no longer restricted to the collective presbytery of the city of Rome, but was conferred on representative prelates of all the Latin Churches, and of the titular Oriental ones also) to give a quasi-œcumenical character to the election. In fact, scarcely any proof is stronger to a canonist that no universal jurisdiction was attributed by the ancient Church to the Roman Bishopric than that the election of the Pope should have been for the first thousand years a purely local one. The maxim, 'Nemo invitis detur,' would have been called into operation had the remaining Patriarchates thought for a moment that the Roman clergy and people could give them a master when they pleased. And though the Imperial licence and consent, which formed an element in all Papal elections for many centuries, may be conceivably taken as standing for the assent of all the laity of the Empire, there was no expression of any kind provided for the yet more important vote of the dispersive clergy.

Unimpeachable as the new electoral scheme appeared, it dangerously narrowed the constituency, making it actually easier to tamper with, and even to vitiate and disqualify altogether; while, as respects even the certainty of result and avoidance of double returns which was hoped for, two remarkable cases of disputed elections occurred within a century. The first of these was at the death of Honorius II. in 1130. Sixteen Cardinals, who were in the late Pope's palace, concealing the fact of his death from their colleagues and the Roman clergy and people, clandestinely elected Cardinal Gregory Guidone² on the following day, by the title of Innocent II. Thirty-two cardinals, with the approval of the whole body of the Roman clergy and of the nobility, except the Corsi and Frangipani, elected Cardinal Peter Leonis, by the title of Anacletus II., and both were consecrated to the Papacy on the same day, Innocent in S. Mary Major, and Anacletus

¹ Muratori, *Ann. d' Italia*, vii. 124.

² This family was later known as De Paparesca, and still exists as the Mattei.

in S. Peter's. It is indisputable, as a legal question, that under either the older or the newer system of electing, Anacletus was the lawful Pope; but Innocent contrived to secure the help of the all-powerful S. Bernard, who induced the Emperor Lothar II. to lead an army to Rome, and put Innocent forcibly into possession, another defect in his title, as noted above, although he is reckoned as the lawful occupant, and Anacletus as the anti-Pope. The second instance was that after the death of Hadrian IV. in 1159, when there was again a double election, and though Alexander III. had fourteen votes in the conclave of cardinals as against nine for his competitor Victor IV., yet the latter had the whole body of the Roman clergy, and the assent of the great majority of the laity, on his side; while the only tribunal before which the rival claims were tried, that of the Council of Pavia in 1160, gave judgment in his favour. It is true that Alexander's refusal, and Victor's consent, to recognise the authority of the Council may have gone far in swaying its decision, but the fact that it did so decide must be held to leave Alexander's election doubtful at best.¹

A doubt of yet another kind, not hitherto touched upon, arises in connexion with the seventy years' session of the Popes at Avignon, from 1309 to 1379, often styled the 'Babylonian Captivity.' It is concerned with the canonical duty of residence at their Sees, imposed on all Bishops, and as it is obvious that the Avignonese Popes did not profess to be Bishops of that city, nor to have transferred to it any of the privileges of Rome, their episcopate was purely titular, representing no actual fact, and in particular, entirely dissociated from the local Roman clergy and people, whose right to share in Papal elections, however neglected and indeed overridden in practice, was yet formally reserved to them by the constitution of Nicolas II. It is more probable than not, that this protracted severance of the Bishops of Rome from their See constitutes a fresh breach in the succession, even had the two huge gaps, already mentioned, been bridged over. For the Roman contention is that S. Peter, by his twenty-five years' residence and death in Rome, and by that alone—as no documentary proof exists—transferred his primacy from Antioch to Rome, his ultimate *residence* being the sole nexus between the Universal Primacy and the local bishopric. They admit that he might have fixed it in any other Church, but that by his final residence in Rome he established it for ever there.

Accordingly, when the Popes went to Avignon, perma-

¹ Labbe, *Conc.* xiii. 266.

nentl
did in
done
cessio
being
failed
could
Avig
S. Pe
of A
is no
for th
never
Petri
line
Rom
F
Sard
supre
Patri
pain
and
See
F
there
Schia
and
impo
and
unde
Thusa
max
acco
jectu
any
alike
and
and
the l
repr
of P
1
Barth
'De
print

nently resided there, and died and were buried there, they did in regard to Rome precisely what S. Peter is said to have done in regard to Antioch, they broke up the Roman succession, and created a new primacy at Avignon. For *residence* being an essential condition of the episcopate, that condition failed utterly during the Avignon period, and its resumption could not rehabilitate the succession. The Popes living in Avignon could no more be considered Bishops of Rome, than S. Peter living in Rome could be considered as still Bishop of Antioch. And Pope Benedict XIV. says, 'No one who is not Bishop of Rome can be styled Successor of Peter, and for that reason the words of the Lord "Feed My sheep" can never be applied to him' (*De Synod. Dioces. II. i.*). Thus the Petrine principle is *Ubi Roma, ibi Papa*, whereas, to make the line of Avignon valid, the converse proposition, *Ubi Papa, ibi Roma*, has to be asserted.

Furthermore, by the canons of all the Councils, from Sardica to Trent, and from that to the Bull of Pius IV., *In suprema militantis Ecclesie specula*, 'every Bishop, even of Patriarchal rank, is compelled to a *personal* residence, under pain of deprivation;' the Popes therefore, as Bishops of Rome, and even as Patriarchs, fall under the universal law, and the See of Rome was *ipso facto* void during the Avignon Papacy.¹

But there is no need to press heavily upon this point, since there is a more serious flaw behind—that due to the Great Schism. From 1379 to 1409, or more strictly till 1417, two and sometimes three rival Popes disputed the Papacy. It is impossible to decide which had the better claim in any case, and the conduct of the Councils of Pisa and Constance, which undertook to settle the matter, does but complicate it further. Thus every Pope within this period is doubtful, and the maxim of Bellarmine, cited above, that 'a doubtful Pope is accounted as no Pope,' bars any falling back on the conjecture that one or other must have been the true Pope in any given year of the schism, and compels the rejection of all alike. Such was, in fact, the decision arrived at both at Pisa and at Constance, for the former deposed both Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII., electing Alexander V. in their place; and the latter deposed these two over again, and also John XXIII., representative of the new line set up at Pisa. The Council of Pisa is rejected by Ultramontanes on very strong legal

¹ See this whole question discussed at length by the great canonist Bartholomew Carranza de Miranda, Archbishop of Toledo, in his treatise 'De Residentia Episcoporum,' read before the Council of Trent, and printed in Le Plat's *Monum. Conc. Trid.*, iii. 521-84.

grounds, chiefly that it was not convened by any competent authority, being merely summoned by the Cardinals of the two factions; and that its proceedings were irregular in themselves, and without due process of law. But if Pisa was no true Council, neither was Constance, for it was summoned by John XXIII., whose own title rests on Pisa alone, he being successor to the line of Alexander V.; and the mode of voting at it was entirely novel, being by nations, and others than bishops and cardinals being allowed a vote. The two councils stand or fall together (Bossuet, *Defens. Declar. Cleri Gall.* II. ix. 12). What this means in law is that there had been no true Pope after the death of Gregory XI. in 1378, and therefore that all persons claiming to be cardinals by any subsequent creation were mere pretenders, without any electoral powers. The extreme Italian Papalists went much further, and held that, as all jurisdiction proceeds from the Pope, and invalidly elected Popes could not give what they did not themselves possess, there had been no validly ordained Bishops or Priests after the death of Gregory XI., and consequently all orders and sacraments ministered by such persons were null and void.

'After the death of Gregory XI., of happy memory, no person belonging to the party of the invalidly elected Pontiff has obtained the priestly dignity, nor can lawful sacraments be had from any such Priests, seeing that the jurisdiction for conferring priestly orders has failed. Consequently, those who are in the obedience of a false Pontiff, though in good faith and a pure conscience, if they fall in with any one ordained by the new Bishops, if they adore the Host and chalice, will not adore the Body and Blood of Christ, but the mere substance of bread and of wine mingled with water, as it were an idol.'¹

This theory, and the confirmation it derives in part from the rejection of both lines of Pontiffs, rather than the selection of either, by the two Councils, has a very important bearing on the election of Martin V. at Constance. That election was made by the joint action of the twenty-three titular Cardinals present, and thirty electors chosen by the Council itself, six from each of the five nations represented. But there was only one Cardinal then living who had been created before the death of Gregory XI., and he was that very Peter of Luna who claimed to be Benedict XIII., and refused to acknowledge the right of the Council to question his title, inas-

¹ Coluccio Salutato, Papal Secretary, writing in 1398 to Jodocus, Margrave of Brandenburg and Moravia, apud Martene (*Thes. Anecd.* ii. 1160).

much
and
Thus
Card.
(who
one
either
newe
elect
nothi
and
hand
tion,
or hi
not t
than

I
tifica
crow
Card
1492
dina
Sfor
toria
and
As I
itsel
dom
void
1503
six,
were
Car
also
And
sisti

1
2
been
Orde
thou
pass
days
Mag
Step
3

much as the submission of his two competitors, Gregory XII. and John XXIII., left him the only possibly valid Pope.¹ Thus all the votes cast for Otto Colonna as Pope by nominal Cardinals were void; and it does not appear how the Council (whose own validity is so gravely doubtful) could create for this one turn a wholly new constituency, having no relation to either the ancient one of the Roman clergy and people, or the newer one of the College of Cardinals. If the thirty conciliar electors were only assessors to the Cardinals, they effected nothing, as none of those Cardinals had a right to vote at all, and the election is void on that ground. If, on the other hand, they had a substantive vote, and in fact made the election, then they created a wholly new Papacy, having no legal or historical continuity with the older one, and tracing back, not to S. Peter and his alleged Divine privilege, but no further than the Council of Constance itself.²

It might be thought that so many breaches in the Pontifical succession would have sufficed, but yet another and crowning one still remains to be recorded. The infamous Cardinal Roderic de Borgia was elected in the conclave of 1492 by a majority of twenty-two out of twenty-seven Cardinals, whose votes had been purchased by Cardinal Ascanio Sforza, as recorded by Von Eggs, the Roman Catholic historian of the Cardinals, in his *Pontificium Doctum* (p. 251) and *Purpura Docta*, in *Vita Card. Ascan. Sforzæ*, iii. 251. As Pope Alexander VI., Borgia openly sold the cardinalate itself to the highest purchasers,³ so that both his own popehood and their membership of the Sacred College were all void by reason of simony. But Julius II. was elected in 1503 in a conclave of thirty-seven Cardinals, of whom twenty-six, or rather over the two-thirds necessary for a valid choice, were of Alexander VI.'s invalid creation, while the same Cardinal Sforza is known to have managed that conclave also, most probably in the same fashion as the previous one.⁴ And finally, Leo X. was elected in 1513 in a conclave consisting entirely of Cardinals created by either Alexander VI.

¹ Maimbourg, *Histoire du Grand Schisme d'Occident*, ii. 253.

² It is not unworthy of remark that former elections of Popes had been challenged as invalid, on the ground of the elect not being in Holy Orders, and that this throws a fresh doubt on Martin V.'s election, for, though a Cardinal, he was not even a Deacon when chosen, but was passed through the three grades of the hierarchy on three successive days, before being consecrated as Pope upon the fourth. Von der Hardt, *Magn. Conc. Constant.* iv. 1486-90. This contravened a decree of Stephen IV. in 769.

³ Guicciardini, *Istor. d' Italia*, v.

⁴ Palatii, *Fasti Cardinalium*.

or Julius II., and therefore incompetent to elect. The electoral body was thus utterly vitiated and disqualified by canon law at least so far back as 1513, and no conceivably valid election of a Pope has taken place since that of Innocent VIII., in 1484, even if every defect prior to that date be condoned, and it be conceded that the breaches in the tenth, eleventh, and fifteenth centuries were made good somehow. There has not been any retrospective action taken in regard to this final vitiation by simony; and to Alexander VI. belongs the responsibility of having made any assertion of unbroken and canonical devolution of a Petrine privilege in the line of Roman Pontiffs impossible for any honest canonist or historian since his time. And, consequently, not only have the specific Divine privileges alleged to be attached to the person and office of the Roman Pontiff all utterly failed, but the whole ecclesiastical jurisdiction appertaining to or derived from the See of Rome has failed throughout the entire Latin obedience. All acts done by the Popes themselves, or requiring Papal sanction for validity, since 1492 (just twenty-five years before the outbreak of the Lutheran revolt) have been inherently null and void, because emanating from usurping and illicit Pontiffs, every one of whom has been uncanonically intruded into the Papal Chair by mere titular electors, having no legal claim to vote at all. Those orders and sacraments in the Latin Church which depend on the valid succession of the dispersive episcopate and priesthood continue unimpaired, but all that is distinctively Papal died out four centuries ago, and continues now as a mere delusive phantom.

The only plea which can be set up in defence of the Ultramontane theory is that of begging the whole question, and saying, 'As it is certain that S. Peter did receive the privileges of infallibility and sovereign jurisdiction over the whole Church, and that he conveyed and transmitted them indefeasibly to the Popes of Rome, who are his successors, it is necessary to believe as matter of faith, in despite of any seemingly adverse testimony, that God took care that the gates of hell should never prevail against His Church, and that the succession on which all true jurisdiction depends has been preserved unimpaired amidst all the troubles and dangers which have beset it.'

This, of course, does not meet the difficulty at all; and the truer way of regarding the question is to say, 'If God have indeed attached such inestimable privileges to the Papal Chair, and if, as all theologians and canonists agree, the

occup
exerco
been
and,
recko
that
world
none
of its
mere
histor

T
can b
flaws
ciscly
actual
and
traste
the o
See o
and
equal
result
validi
claim
no Po
as A
merel
apost
instan
of G
the p
ordin
certai

T
by sin
ceded
irregu
Coun
de ju
Cardi
ciples
Coun
and
with

occupant of that chair must be validly elected in order to exercise them, then we shall find on inquiry that the line has been regular and undisputed from the first; that no doubt, and, above all, no invalidity, attaches to any one of those reckoned in the succession. And the superabundant proof that such is not the case, that actually no See in the whole world has so many flaws of the gravest kind in its pedigree, none has ever sunk morally so low and so often in the person of its pontiffs, is the final disproof of the Petrine claims, as a mere human legend, destitute of any Scriptural, legal, or historical basis.

The remarkable weakness of the line of Papal succession can be most clearly exhibited in a chronological table of the flaws in legitimate transmission of the Chair, which are precisely analogous to failures of proof of regular descent, or actual proofs of bastardy, in a family pedigree on which titles and estates depend. Their number may be usefully contrasted with the two intrusions (Stigand and Tillotson) and the one doubtful election (Pole) in five hundred years of the See of Canterbury. It is to be remembered that intrusion and simony are absolute disqualifications, heresy an almost equal one, and that all questions of doubt, either where the result of an election has been reasonably questioned, or invalidity may attach to the election itself, are ruled against the claimant by Bellarmine's maxim, 'A doubtful Pope is counted no Pope.' All persons reckoned, whether justly or unjustly, as Antipopes, are excluded from the following table, and merely legendary stories, such as that of Pope Marcellinus's apostasy, and rigidly technical objections, such as apply, for instance, to the orthodoxy of Nicolas I., and to the election of Gelasius II., are omitted also; so as to state the case for the prosecution as moderately as possible. The names in ordinary letters mark the doubtful Popes, those in italics the certainly invalid and irregular ones:—See Table on next page.

The Electoral College of Cardinals was completely vitiated by simony under Alexander VI., and thus, even if it be conceded that the Papacy was saved somehow through former irregular transmissions, or was validly reconstituted by the Council of Constance, there has been by Roman canon law no *de jure* Pope since 1492 at latest, consequently no *de jure* Cardinal, and thus no means exist on Ultramontane principles for restoring the Petrine succession; though a General Council of the Latin Church might probably set up a new and canonically valid episcopate in the See of Rome, but with no shadow of claim to any Divine charter of privilege.

Name of Pope	Date	Nature of defect	Authority for fact
Victor I. or Zephyrinus	193-202	} Heresy ¹	Tertullian, <i>Adv. Prax.</i> i.
Callistus I.	202-219		
Liberius	352-367	Heresy	S. Hippolytus, <i>Ref. Hær.</i> ix. 6.
Felix II.	367		
Damasus I.	367-385	Heresy and invalid election	S. Jerome, <i>Chron. ann.</i> 357
		Disputed election, and homicidal entrance on see	S. Athanasius, <i>Ad Monachos.</i>
Zozimus	417, 418	Disputed election, and forcible entrance on see	Marcellin. et Faust. Libellus.
Boniface I.	418-423	Heresy	His Letter acquitting Pelagius and Cælestius
			Baronius, <i>Ann.</i> 419
Hormisda	511-523	Probable simony	His Letter to Possessor, Baronius, <i>Ann.</i> 520, xvi-xviii
Boniface II.	530-532	Probable simony	Cassiodorus, <i>Var.</i> ix. 15
John II.	532-535	Intrusion and simony	<i>Idem</i> , <i>ibid.</i>
Vigilius	540-555	Intrusion	Liberatus, <i>Breviar.</i> xxii.
Pelagius I.	555-559	Heresy	Anastatius Bibliothec.
Honorius I.	626-640		His Letters, burnt at Sixth General Council
Eugenius I.	655-657	Intrusion ²	Anastatius Bibliothec.
Sergius I.	687-701	Simony ³	Anastatius Bibliothec.
Eugenius II.	824-827	Disputed election	Anastatius Bibliothec.
Formosus	891-896	Doubtful election	Baronius
Boniface VI.	896	Intrusion	Baronius
Stephen VI.	896, 897	Intrusion	Baronius
John IX.	898-900	Disputed election	Flodoard
Christopher	903, 904	Intrusion	Baronius
Sergius III.	904-911	Intrusion	Baronius
Anastatius III.	911-914	Intrusion	Baronius
Lando	914	Intrusion	Baronius
John X.	914-929	Intrusion	Baronius
Leo VI.	929-931	Intrusion	Baronius
Stephen VII.	931	Intrusion	Baronius
John XI.	931-933	Intrusion	Baronius
Leo VII.	936-939	Intrusion ⁴	Baronius
Stephen VIII.	939-943	Intrusion	Baronius

¹ The reference is not to the Pope's temporary encouragement of Montanism, as to which Tertullian's wishes may have deceived him, but to complicity with the Sabelian teaching of Praxeas, a wholly distinct charge.

² There was no moral guilt in this case, and the intrusion was condoned; but it is a legal flaw all the same.

³ This was rather technical than actual simony. The money was not paid to secure election, but was extorted by the Exarch after the election, as the price of the necessary civil sanction.

⁴ There was an interregnum of three years between John XI. and Leo VII.

Martin
Agapetus
John
Leo V.
Benedict
Benedict
John
Benedict
Gregory
Innocent
Alexander
Hadrian
Boniface
Clement
John
Urban
(Rome)
Clement
(Ave)
Boniface
(Rome)
Benedict
(Ave)
Innocent
(Rome)
Gregory
(Rome)
Alexander
John
Martin
Innocent
Alexander
Julius
Leo X.

¹ He
But, as I
that he v
² The
cessor, C

Name of Pope	Date	Nature of defect	Authority for fact
<i>Martin III.</i>	943-946	Intrusion	Baronius
<i>Agapetus II.</i>	946-955	Intrusion	Baronius
<i>John XII.</i>	955-963	Intrusion	Baronius
<i>Leo VIII.</i>	963-965	Disputed election	Liutprand
<i>Benedict V.</i>	964, 965	Disputed election	Liutprand
<i>Benedict VIII.</i>	1012-1024	Intrusion and simony	
<i>John XIX.</i>	1033-1046	Intrusion and simony	Desider. Cassin.
<i>Benedict IX.</i>	1033-1046	Intrusion and simony	Radulphus Glaber.
<i>Gregory VI.</i>	1044-1046	Simony	Acts of Council of Sutri
<i>Innocent II.</i>	1130-1143	Disputed election	Arnulf. Lexov. <i>De Schism.</i>
<i>Alexander III.</i>	1159-1181	Disputed election	Acts of Council of Pavia
<i>Hadrian V.</i>	1276	Only a deacon ¹	Raynaldus
<i>Boniface VIII.</i>	1294-1303	Doubtful election ²	Raynaldus
<i>Clement V.</i>	1305-1314	Simony	Raynaldus
<i>John XXII.</i>	1316-1334	Heresy	Raynaldus, ann. 1331-34
<i>Urban VI.</i>	1378-1389	Doubtful election	
(Rome)			
<i>Clement VII.</i>	1378-1394	Doubtful election	
(Avignon)			
<i>Boniface IX.</i>	1389-1404	Doubtful election	
(Rome)			
<i>Benedict XIII.</i>	1394-1409	Doubtful election	Maimbourg, <i>Histoire du Grand Schisme d'Occident</i>
(Avignon)			
<i>Innocent VII.</i>	1404-1406	Doubtful election	
(Rome)			
<i>Gregory XII.</i>	1406-1409	Doubtful election	
(Rome)			
<i>Alexander V.</i>	1409, 1410	Doubtful election	
<i>John XXIII.</i>	1410-1415	Doubtful election and heresy	
<i>Martin V.</i>	1417-1431	Irregular election	Von der Hardt, <i>Magn. Conc. Const.</i>
<i>Innocent VIII.</i>	1484-1492	Probable simony	Raynaldus, ann. 1484, 28, 31
<i>Alexander VI.</i>	1492-1503	Simony	Von Eggs, <i>Purpura Docta</i> , iii. 251
<i>Julius II.</i>	1503-1513	Invalid election	Palatii, <i>Fasti Cardin.</i>
<i>Leo X.</i>	1513-1521	Invalid election	Palatii, <i>Fasti Cardin.</i>

No valid election has been possible since.

¹ He was a dying man when elected, and did not live long enough for consecration. But, as he made some important changes in the mode of electing the Popes, it is clear that he was fully Pope without being successor to any episcopate of S. Peter.

² The doubt arises from the questionable validity of the abdication of his predecessor, Celestine V., which created the vacancy.

SHORT NOTICES.

An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers. By various Writers. Edited by CHARLES JOHN ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Vol. III. (London: Cassell and Co., Limited, 1883.)

THE third volume of Bishop Ellicott's commentary on the Old Testament is a decided improvement upon its predecessors, and contains some really valuable work. The books comprised in it are the historical ones from 1 Kings to Esther. Of these 1 Kings has been assigned to the Bishop of Sydney, 2 Kings and Chronicles to the Rev. C. J. Ball, Ezra and Nehemiah to the Rev. W. B. Pope, while the notes on Esther are from the pen of the Rev. R. Sinkler.

Dr. Barry's name is of itself a sufficient guarantee for the excellence of the commentary on 1 Kings, which (so far as it goes) is thoroughly satisfactory. There is, however, some inconvenience resulting from the fact that the two books of Kings were assigned to different writers. It was probably owing to the demands upon the Bishop's time that he was unable to undertake more than his very limited share; but, as he himself remarks in his preface, the history of the kings is really but one book, and the division, borrowed by us from the LXX and Vulgate, not only has no existence in the Hebrew, but is 'a purely arbitrary division, not even corresponding to any marked epoch in the history.' Since this is the case it would have been well if the editor could have secured unity of plan and treatment by entrusting the whole work to one writer. The Bishop and Mr. Ball have evidently taken rather different views of the scope of the work required from them; and although the notes of each are excellent in their way, yet we should have preferred to see the whole of Kings annotated by the one and the labours of the other confined to the Chronicles. The commentary on this latter book stands out pre-eminently as a most useful piece of work. It is free and bold in its criticism, but thoroughly reverent in tone. Moreover, while Mr. Ball has learnt much from foreign Continental critics of an advanced school, yet he is never afraid of speaking strongly (where necessary) of their prejudice and unfairness. More than one of them comes in at times for a well-merited rebuke. Thus there is a wholesome note on 2 Chronicles xxiv. 26.

'Reuss is incorrect in asserting that the names of the *mothers* are substituted by the chronicler for the names of the *fathers*. Thenius even knows the reason why the chronicler has added the epithets "Ammonitess," "Moabitess." The writer wished to show that the idolatry into which he makes Joash lapse (?) was avenged by two sons of idolatrous wives (!). This is fancy determined by prejudice.'

So also the reader will find some very helpful remarks in the introduction with regard to the historical value of the Chronicles

and it
the fo

'It
more p
paralle

'T
criticis
centur
transc
Samue
unders
history
unhisto
the fol
bounde
incline
hypoth

Altoge
of the
Scriptu
Chron
attitud
the vie
very l
momen
effect
book,
of the

Th
Rev. V
thin, a
class.
Dr. Pe
as 'br
course
are as
which

The G
B
G

SOME
commen
fourth
ing lite
S. Joh
to sigh
less, '
with th
one G

and its relation to Samuel and Kings ; and the caution contained in the following extract strikes us as peculiarly well-timed :—

‘It remains to ask what is the precise relation between the forty or more passages of Chronicles which are more or less exact duplicates of parallel passages in Samuel and Kings.

This question can hardly be answered with certainty. The negative criticism which flourished in Germany at the beginning of the present century found an easy, off-hand reply in the theory that the chronicler transcribed his parallel accounts directly from the canonical books of Samuel and Kings. All deviations and peculiarities were results of misunderstanding, fictitious embellishment, and wilful perversion of the older history. It would hardly be worth while to revive the memory of this unhistorical and obsolete criticism, were it not still salutary to signalize the former errors of scholars whose theories for a time enjoyed unbounded influence, by way of suggesting caution to such persons as are inclined to accord a too hasty acceptance to similarly destructive hypotheses advocated by men of acknowledged ability at the present day.’

Altogether this commentary may be cordially recommended as one of the very best that there is for English readers upon this portion of Scripture. The majority of readers probably know less of the Chronicles than of any other of the historical books. And yet our attitude towards a large part of modern criticism must depend upon the view which we take of the trustworthiness or the contrary of this very book. In this lies its immense importance at the present moment, and we sincerely trust that Mr. Ball's labours may have the effect of turning the attention of students to this much-neglected book, and leading them to enter more closely into the consideration of the very difficult problems connected with it.

There is not much that calls for remark in the work of the Rev. W. B. Pope and the Rev. R. Sinkler. It strikes us as poor and thin, and, though free from serious blunders, is not of a very high class. There is, by the way, an absurd slip on p. 508, where Dr. Pope has succeeded in representing one of Eliashib's *grandsons* as ‘brought into prominence as married to *Sanballat*’! This of course is a mere *lapsus calami*, but the notes on these later books are as a rule meagre and contrast unfavourably with the thoroughness which marks those in the earlier part of the volume.

The Gospel according to S. John, with Notes Critical and Practical.
By the Rev. M. F. SADLER, Prebendary of Wells. (London : George Bell and Sons, 1883.)

SOME months ago we called attention in this Review to Mr. Sadler's commentary on S. Matthew. From the first he has now passed to the fourth Gospel, and added another volume to the already overwhelming literature which has sprung up in connexion with the writings of S. John. We confess that for ourselves we are sometimes disposed to sigh over the multiplicity of commentaries. They are simply endless. ‘The cry is still “They come !”’ and the attempt to keep pace with them all has to be abandoned as hopeless. Take those on this one Gospel alone which have appeared in this country during the

last few years. Apart from the works of Dean Alford and Bishop Wordsworth, which were also the first in the field and occupy a place of their own, there is the highly valuable one by Archdeacon Watkins in Bishop Ellicott's New Testament for English readers. Then there are the two excellent volumes by Mr. Plummer in the Cambridge Bible and Greek Testament for schools and colleges, and Dr. Sanday's suggestive treatise on the authorship and historical character of the fourth Gospel (a book which is, alas ! already out of print, but which surely ought to be republished) ; and, lastly, there is Dr. Westcott's exhaustive commentary, in which he has given to the world the results of some thirty years' profound thought. These are only a few of the best known, but besides all these there are the numerous translations of the works of foreign writers, written from every conceivable standpoint, with which Messrs. T. and T. Clark, of Edinburgh, have made the English public familiar, among which those of Meyer and Godet stand pre-eminent. And now Mr. Sadler comes before us with another volume ! Nor are we disposed to complain that he has done so. This endless literature is a misfortune, but it is a necessity. 'Books beget books, and controversies are multiplied,' as Fuller quaintly puts it, and if Mr. Sadler feels, as he evidently does, that there is much in the tendencies and teaching of the popular modern commentaries which is misleading, he is surely right to endeavour to lead his readers back to the fertile pastures of patristic lore. This, we take it, is the *raison d'être* of this commentary. While modern writers are but seldom mentioned by name, yet it is easy to see that throughout the author is constantly compelled to reject their conclusions. The 'ancient' and 'modern' views of difficult passages are set over against each other, and a strong preference is usually expressed for the former. We think that Mr. Sadler is perhaps a little wanting in sympathy with modern criticism, but it is certainly well that the attention of readers in general should be drawn again to the rich vein of suggestive thought and the warm light of spiritual teaching to be found in the pages of Augustine and Chrysostom. In saying this we do not forget that frequent quotations from these Fathers are to be found in the works of other writers, who of course have cited them again and again. What we mean is rather this, that in most other commentaries we miss the sympathetic reverence for patristic teaching which is especially characteristic of Mr. Sadler, and that we do not find elsewhere the same deference for the judgment of antiquity which marks the pages of the work which lies before us. Hence, in spite of the protest which we feel bound to raise against the ever-growing number of commentaries, we are compelled to acknowledge that there was room for this one ; nor do we hesitate to express a hope that Mr. Sadler may be able to fulfil his original design and add yet two volumes more, on the Gospels of S. Mark and S. Luke.

In the matter of Church teaching our readers will know beforehand pretty well what to expect, and we venture to say that they will not be disappointed if they turn to such 'test passages' as chapters iii. and vi., or to the great commission given to the Apostles in chapter

xx.
men
Chur
comm
sequ
to th
It is
well
and
'If th
(
only
Chur
sions
last
maki
evang
is rep
God ;
from
but of
in S.
ness,
repro

W
secon
'lay'
treati
althou
extan
imper
the in
beggin
where
the Sa
surpri
impea
so gre
Sadler
and o
stricte
theref
critica
a char

The C
S
M
J
M
LITUR

xx. The notes are too long for citation here, but we strongly recommend all who would see the bearing of these passages on great Church doctrines to turn to them for themselves. Besides this the commentary will be found especially helpful in tracing out the sequence of thought in our Lord's discourses, and calling attention to the practical bearing of His teaching on Christian life in all ages. It is full of suggestive thoughts, and contains many hints which will well repay the student who will take the trouble to work them out and follow them up for himself. Here is a good note on c. viii. 36, 'If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed':—

'I have several times noticed how the words of Christ which are found only in this Gospel were seeds which sprang up and fructified in the Church and were the root of her highest doctrine, though the actual expressions were not put on record till near the time of the departure of the last surviving Apostle. These words of Christ respecting the Son making men free indeed are the root of all that teaching respecting evangelical and moral freedom which permeates S. Paul's Epistles, and is represented in such phrases as "the glorious liberty of the children of God"; "the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death"; "we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free"; "Jerusalem, which is above, is free." We have the same in S. Peter's "free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness." But it is still more decidedly and, we may say, philosophically reproduced in S. James' "law of liberty" (James i. 25, ii. 12).'

We have noticed a few slips which might well be corrected in a second edition. On p. 263, by the way, there is a grammatical error, 'lay' for 'laid.' In the introduction Mr. Sadler speaks of S. Clement's treatise *Τὴς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος* as a 'lost book.' This is a mistake, although a not uncommon one. The treatise in question is still extant, preserved in a single MS., described as a late and somewhat imperfect one. These are not matters of great importance, but in the interests of theological truth we cannot conclude without earnestly begging Mr. Sadler to revise his language in the notes on chapter i., where he several times speaks of the 'separate personality' of God the Son. Such language is, to say the least, misleading, and we are surprised to find it sanctioned by a writer whose orthodoxy is so unimpeachable, and for whose general accuracy of statement we have so great an admiration. *Distinct* personality is of course what Mr. Sadler means; but there is a real difference between the two words, and one on which it is important to insist. On such a subject the strictest accuracy of statement is an imperative necessity; we trust, therefore, that Mr. Sadler will forgive us and not deem us hypercritical for calling his attention to this matter and for begging for a change of phrase.

The Greek Liturgies, chiefly from Original Authorities. By C. A. SWAINSON, D.D., Master of Christ's College, and Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity, Cambridge, &c. (London: C. J. Clay and Son, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane, 1884.)

LITURGICAL scholars owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Swainson for

this valuable and interesting contribution to the materials for their favourite study. It is a book, indeed, whose appearance must mark a new departure in the treatment of the texts of the ancient liturgies. Hitherto all the editions of the Liturgies of S. James and S. Mark have been, so far as the text goes, but reprints of the *editiones principes*. Assemani and Daniel, who have given a few various readings of the Liturgy of S. James from two other sources, make no critical use of them. There has been up to this time but one MS. of S. Mark's Liturgy known; and the Liturgies of S. Basil and S. Chrysostom have been reprinted from late forms even by Goar, who adds various readings and notes from several MSS. Nor, indeed, could it well have been otherwise. Dr. Swainson seems to blame (Introd. p. xxxii) 'the general tone of modern liturgical investigation' for having failed in proper attention to the text; but he thereby raises a suspicion that he has not himself grasped the necessary conditions for a proper critical handling of the text, among which first and foremost is the accumulation of sufficient materials. It would have been ridiculous in any editor hitherto to attempt what Dr. Swainson has now done in comparing and arranging different authorities for the same liturgies, simply because he has been the first to procure the transcripts and collations of most of these authorities. All credit be given to him for this work. The words of the author shall describe what he claims to have done.

'The S. Chrysostom, the Presanctified, and the S. James of the Rossano MS. are printed now for the first time: so is the Presanctified of the Barberini MS.; so too the fragment of S. Mark from the Messina Roll and the entire Liturgy of S. Mark from the Vatican Roll, and the three liturgies of the Mediæval Church from the MSS. of Lady Burdett-Coutts. I may also claim as newly edited almost the whole of the Liturgy of S. James from the Messina Roll discovered by Monaldinus, and, as appearing now for the first time, the whole of the same liturgy as found in the Rossano¹ and in the two Paris MSS. The Paris copy of "S. Peter" and the collations of the British Museum MSS. of S. Basil and S. Chrysostom are also new' (Introduction, p. xxvi).

So that, whereas a printed text and readings from two MSS. comprised all that was known of the S. James, Dr. Swainson has printed in full the texts of these two and two fresh MSS. Whereas one MS. of S. Mark only was known, he has given us a new collation of this, another new text entire, and a considerable fragment (of the Anaphora) from a third; while by recollating and transcribing the Liturgies of S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, and the Presanctified from the Cod. Barberini, Cod. Rossanensis, the two of the eleventh and twelfth centuries from the library of Lady Burdett-Coutts, and others in the British Museum and National Library at Paris, and by arranging them as far as possible with their corresponding parts in juxtaposition, he has endeavoured to show the developments, as he believes, of these liturgies from the eighth century to modern times.

It will require some time to digest so much new material and take the true bearing of all the facts there brought to light. We feel

¹ The same as claimed eight lines earlier,

that it is impossible as yet to say how far Dr. Swainson's conclusions are correct. He himself is very wise in impressing upon us lessons of caution; and two points in particular suggest themselves with regard to which caution is very needful. (1) It is interesting and valuable to see how the *written* forms of liturgies developed; but surely a much larger induction will be necessary than that for which Dr. Swainson has the materials even now, before we can be sure that we are on secure ground. It is a large assumption that the form of a liturgy contained in a single MS., standing by itself, even though we knew its date, *represents the 'liturgy of that date.'* It may, but it may not. A MS. for use in a convent might be expected to have peculiarities of its own. One for use in the Patriarchal church might differ from one used in an ordinary parish church. The use of the neighbourhood of Constantinople probably differed from that of some remote or isolated diocese. Hence one necessity for special caution. And on this ground, though grateful to Dr. Swainson for what he has done, we can only look upon his work as a first step in the right direction, which needs many more before the whole truth is discovered. Now that Dr. Swainson has shown the possibility of discoveries in the way of liturgical MSS. we may hope that other scholars and travellers will turn their attention in this direction.¹ (2) The other reason why caution is needed is this: There is a tendency in some minds—natural, perhaps, but often mistaken—to argue that the information contained in a given document is exhaustive in respect to its subject, forgetting that it may absolutely require to be supplemented from other sources. Now 'Omission is prohibition' may be a stick good enough for a law court to beat a Ritualist with, but it will not stand the test of facts or common sense. In the case of early liturgical MSS., to suppose that there was nothing in the service of the Church for which we do not find explicit directions in the MSS. is most probably absolutely erroneous; indeed, in some important cases we can prove it. Turn, for instance, to the Western Sacramentaries. Nothing could be more meagre, even unintelligible, than the service, if we were to suppose that it consisted of nothing beyond what we find in the Sacramentary itself. A bare skeleton of the Ordo, the Canon, and three proper collects is all that the Gregorian Sacramentary indicates for the Mass of any given day. Yet we know from the *Ordines Romani* (published by Mabillon and others) that a very elaborate ritual admitted of being engrafted upon this; while to suppose that there was no ritual beyond the dry bones of the Sacramentary would be an outrage upon common sense. Similarly with the Gallican Sacramentaries, a group of six or seven (the normal number) prayers is all that we find given for the service of the day. Yet here we know from the so-called *Brevis Expositio* that the ritual and its accessories were elaborate and rich. The fact is, the study of liturgies cannot be based upon the texts of the liturgies alone. They need to be illustrated by any available side lights, among which

¹ In fact, if we rightly interpret some words on p. xviii, there is still some valuable material at Messina. Three rolls seem to be spoken of, and Dr. Swainson has only procured portions of two.

the notices of liturgical details in canons of councils and the works of ecclesiastical writers are indispensable. When, then, Dr. Swainson hopes (Introd. p. xxxvi) that 'one result of the care and labour bestowed upon this book may be the calling of the attention of some of the authorities of the Churches of the East to the simpler ritual of earlier years'—apparently on the ground that the Barberini MS. presents the text of the liturgies in a shorter and simpler form than the later MSS.—while he may be right as regards the introduction of some of the prayers, we feel that his remark is intended to go a great deal further than is warranted by the evidence produced.

On p. xxxix of the Introduction Dr. Swainson calls attention to a very important point, which deserves a thorough investigation—namely, the extent to which sacrificial terms, adopted straight from the LXX, have been used in the Greek liturgies with direct application to the Eucharist itself and the ministers. His line of argument, however, appears to us to be a curious inversion of the true one. He raises the question whether certain sacrificial terms, as used there, are of very early date; for, he says, 'it is impossible to believe that the language of the Old Testament and the Epistle to the Hebrews as to the office of the Jewish priests could have thus been appropriated by Christians at a very early date.' It has been argued, on the other hand, as by Mr. J. E. Field, in his *Apostolic Liturgy and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, that the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews implies the existence, already at the time when that Epistle was written, of a liturgy worded very much like that of S. James. At all events we should have thought the proper mode of approaching this subject would be to ascertain, if possible, from patristic writings whether and when this sacrificial language was used of the Eucharist, rather than to commence by assuming that it must have been late. The extract from the fifth lecture of Cyril of Jerusalem, printed by Dr. Swainson at p. 209, calls the Eucharist *a θυσία ἱλασμοῦ*, and S. Chrysostom continually uses the strongest sacrificial language about it. At all events, then, there is nothing in such language incompatible with the usage of the middle of the fourth century, if we may not go yet higher.

We must note one more point on which we are constrained to differ from Dr. Swainson. It is a point on which he evidently lays some stress, for he refers to it more than once. We mean the significance of the change of some words in the prayer, *οὐδεὶς ἄγιος τῶν συνδεδεμένων κ.τ.λ.*, of S. Basil's and S. Chrysostom's Liturgies (Introd. p. xlii). In its earlier form the phrase in question was *σὺ γὰρ εἰ ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος καὶ ἀγιάζων καὶ ἀγιαζόμενος, Χριστέ, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν*. By-and-by we find the language changed.

'The words *ἀγιάζων καὶ ἀγιαζόμενος*, which recall us to the time of the Redeemer's self-dedication, are omitted, and we read *σὺ γὰρ εἰ ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος καὶ προσδεχόμενος καὶ διαδιδόμενος, Χριστέ, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν*, transferring the epoch of the Offering of the Saviour to the epoch of the Reception by Himself of the Eucharistic sacrifice and the distribution of Himself.'

So says Dr. Swainson, implying that the phrase was altered

in or
upon
action
Now,
to the
chamb
word
sacrifi
in fact
approv
the ep
strict
(taking
of the
Pasch
been c
was be
—«λῶ
to a p
the fu
truth
that I
presen
betwe
upper
scendi
inasm
of the
of the
of the
used,
Eucha
strict
Jesus
when
Soteri
Dr. Sw
same t
chus)
ristic s
have b
distinct
Epiph
ad Mo
xiv. §
view o
Ha
Swains
himself
lately

in order to make words which had referred only to the action upon the Cross, refer to the action in the upper chamber, which last action was apparently a 'Eucharistic sacrifice,' but not an offering! Now, the assumption that the phrase, as it originally stood, referred to the offering on the Cross, and not to the transaction in the upper chamber, is as gratuitous as Archdeacon Farrar's cool note upon the word 'sacrifice' in chap. xiv. of the *Διδαχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων*—*i.e.* sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving! There is simply no foundation in fact for either. What Dr. Swainson describes with apparent disapproval as 'transferring the epoch of the offering of the Saviour to the epoch of . . . the Eucharistic sacrifice,' is, we venture to affirm, strict Biblical doctrine. The analogy of the Passover typology (taking the view which, on the whole, presents the fewer difficulties of the two alternatives—namely, that the Last Supper was a real Paschal supper) requires that Christ, our true Passover, should have been offered, and partaken of, at the very time when the Paschal lamb was being offered and partaken of. Moreover, the present participles—*ελόμενον, ἐκχυνόμενον, διδόμενον*—in the words of institution point to a present action, a present sacrifice. Our Lord might have used the future tense, had He willed—*i.e.* if it would have expressed the truth better—but He chose the present. We more than suspect that Dr. Swainson prefers the future tenses of the Vulgate to the presents of the original. If we may dare to draw a distinction between things that are essentially indivisible, the transaction in the upper chamber was the supreme moment of His sacrifice, transcending in importance even the blood-shedding upon the Cross, inasmuch as, being the great act of self-dedication—the sacrifice of the will—it was of higher value than the passive endurance of the blood-shedding, which followed as the necessary corollary of the other. It appears to us clear, then, that the words originally used, *ἀγιάζων καὶ ἀγιαζόμενος*, suggested by our Lord's own great Eucharistic prayer of oblation (S. John xvii. 19), were intended, in strict accordance with Scriptural doctrine, to refer to the offering of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist; but that, in process of time, when it was found that they admitted of the misinterpretation which Soterichus, Patriarch elect of Antioch (followed apparently now by Dr. Swainson), put upon them, they were changed to others of the same tenor, but rather more explicit. It is odd to read, 'He' (Soterichus) 'would scarcely have raised the question' (whether the Eucharistic sacrifice could be said to be offered to Christ) 'if antiquity could have been pleaded on behalf of the phraseology,' when we find it distinctly touched upon and explained by Origen, *C. Cels.* viii. 13, Epiph. *Adv. Hær.* lv. § 4; Aug. *De Civ. Dei*, x. 20; Fulg. *Lib. II. ad Monim.* cap. 5, *De Fid. ad Petrum Diac.* c. 19, *Ad Ferrand.* Ep. xiv. § 37, showing that the question was discussed and the orthodox view clearly stated centuries before Soterichus.

Having now indicated some points on which we disagree with Dr. Swainson, let us heartily congratulate him on not having committed himself to any hasty view about the supposed liturgical teaching of the lately discovered treatise, the *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, some

chapters of which he reprints. The conviction has been growing among liturgical scholars that it is a serious mistake to suppose that the forms of prayer in the ninth and tenth chapters of that document are parts of the liturgy; for, assuming that the consecration prayer of the Eucharist was fixed and committed to writing at the early date assigned to this book, which is a matter of dispute, to suppose that it would be inserted in a handbook of general instruction for the Christian laity, such as the *Διδαχὴ* evidently was, which might easily fall into unworthy or heathen hands, is absolutely contrary to all we know of the care with which the early Christians guarded the Mysteries. That the liturgy should be inserted entire in the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, probably more than three centuries later, is nothing to the purpose. By that time the need for that extreme caution had ceased. But even S. Chrysostom will only allude in enigmatical language to the most solemn parts of the liturgy before a mixed congregation. It seems to us perfectly clear that the ninth chapter of the *Διδαχὴ*, like the corresponding parts of the seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions, is neither more nor less than a form of private prayer for the use of communicants, perhaps the earliest extant example of a 'Lay Folks' Mass Book.' A confirmation of this view will be found on referring to the treatise Ps.-Athan. *De Virginitate*, § 13, where the very same formula is given as a 'grace after meat,' to be used by the Regular Virgin. That work, though not by Athanasius, is thought to be as old as the fifth century. Is it likely that the solemn Consecration Prayer would degenerate into an ordinary grace? So of chap. x. of the *Διδαχὴ* we take leave to doubt whether it is a Thanksgiving (even private) after Reception. It appears to us most probably a 'grace after meat.'

But we must return to Dr. Swainson's book. It strikes one as a little odd to find the Liturgy of S. Peter—interesting as are the facts brought to light regarding it—arranged in the middle of the other undoubtedly genuine Eastern liturgies, when it is clearly only an adaptation of the Roman Liturgy; also to find the Liturgies of S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, and the Presanctified designated in the table of contents 'The Liturgies of the Eighth Century,' as if there were no other liturgies at that date. At p. xlii, lines 15, 17, 248, 249 are misprints for 218, 219 respectively, but these are all that we have noticed. We rather desiderate some of the information usually given in books drawn from MS. authorities, from which we might form an opinion as to the manner in which the textual part of the work has been performed. A large portion of the transcriptions have been done at secondhand for Dr. Swainson; and neither here, nor in what he did himself, does he give us any facsimiles, or record any of the peculiarities, palæographical or textual, of the MSS. As to all this therefore we must reserve our judgment. However the book is beautifully printed, and we must end, as we began, with thanking the learned author for a very valuable contribution to the materials for liturgical study.

Novum
su
Ea
sit
Pa

ÆNOTI
Lenger
versity
logical
Illgen,
was a c
duction
(1840).
name f
record
ticism
journey
sonally
and ma
1844 h
Catheri
knows,
magnifi
of the
brough
derick
comme
the pub
Greek,
which,
princip
terval v
but in
the gol
ments
to the
success
by the
Codex
tude, h
nabas,
Cairo a
negotia
Petersh
at the
nificen
material
work u
Greek

Novum Testamentum Græce. Ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit apparatus criticum apposuit CONSTANTINUS TISCHENDORF. Editio octava critica major. Volumen III. Prolegomena. Scripsit CASPARUS RENATUS GREGORY, additis curis † Ezræ Abbot. Pars prior. (Leipzig : J. C. Hinrichs, 1884.)

ÆNOTHEUS FREDERICK CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF was born at Lengenfeld, in Saxony, on January 18, 1815. He entered the University of Leipsic in 1834, and pursued his philological and theological studies there under the direction of Hermann, Winer, Winzer, Ilgen, Grossmann, and Krehl. His first publication of importance was a critical edition of the New Testament in Greek, with an introduction, and a valuable dissertation on the theory of recensions (1840). It was the earnest of those labours which have made his name famous ; and from this time onwards the history of his life is a record of unwearied and self-sacrificing devotion to the textual criticism of the New Testament. The next four years were spent in journeys to the principal libraries of Europe, with the view of personally inspecting all the uncial manuscripts of the New Testament, and making collations of some of the most important of them. In 1844 he visited the East with the same object. In the Convent of S. Catherine at Mount Sinai he had the good fortune, as everyone knows, to rescue from the waste-paper basket several leaves of a magnificent uncial manuscript of the Septuagint, the first instalment of the great Bible now known as the Codex Sinaiticus. These he brought home to Leipsic and named—after his patron King Frederick Augustus of Saxony—the Codex Frederico-Augustanus. The commencement of the decennium from 1849 to 1858 was marked by the publication of the fourth edition of his critical New Testament in Greek, and the close of it by the publication of the seventh edition, which, together with the eighth edition (1869–1872), were the three principal editions which marked the progress of his work. The interval was occupied with fresh journeys in pursuit of manuscripts ; but in the midst of all his labours there was ever present to his mind the golden hope of discovering the remainder of the codex, fragments of which he had brought home from Sinai in 1845. A visit to the convent in 1853 was fruitless, but on a subsequent occasion success rewarded perseverance. On February 4, 1859, he was shown by the steward of the convent the unique treasure now known as the Codex Sinaiticus. Almost beside himself with joy, hope, and gratitude, he spent the night in his cell in transcribing the Epistle of Barnabas, and soon obtained permission to carry the manuscript to Cairo and copy it there. We need not repeat the history of the negotiations by which the prize was secured and deposited at S. Petersburg, and sumptuously edited in facsimile type by Tischendorf, at the expense of the Emperor of Russia. Stimulated by this magnificent discovery, and now at length fully equipped with all the materials he could expect to gather by his own labour, he set to work upon the eighth and, as he hoped, the final edition of his Greek Testament. Scarcely had he completed the text when he was

struck down by paralysis, and, after lingering for nineteen months, died on December 7, 1874.

This hasty sketch of the indefatigable scholar's life may interest those of our readers who have not access to the new volume of *Prolegomena*; but in order to form at all an adequate conception of the vastness of his labours it needs to be supplemented by a careful perusal of the catalogue of his works, which, including articles in reviews, &c., occupies no less than twenty octavo pages of the volume before us.

The task of editing the *Prolegomena* to the eighth edition, for which Tischendorf himself had made but little fresh preparation, was undertaken by Dr. C. R. Gregory, an American scholar who has for several years resided in Germany. The volume before us contains the first instalment of the work, and is divided into seven chapters: (i.) on Tischendorf's life and work; (ii.) on the critical materials collected or rendered available by Tischendorf, or made use of by him after the labours of other scholars; (iii.) on the laws to be observed in constructing the text; (iv.) on the peculiarities of the grammatical forms and the syntax of the New Testament; (v.) on the form of the text—*i.e.* the order of the books and the division into chapters and verses; (vi.) on the history of the text, including a survey of the various theories about 'recensions' and an account of the printed editions; (vii.) on the uncial manuscripts. In the second part we are promised chapters on the cursive manuscripts, the versions, and the use of patristic quotations, together with tables and full indices. The desire to render the list of cursives as complete as possible, and to describe them from personal inspection, has induced Dr. Gregory to withhold for the present the publication of this part of the *Prolegomena*.

It is indeed much to be lamented that Tischendorf did not live to complete his work by giving an account of the critical principles on which his last edition was based. Dr. Gregory has repeated verbatim that portion of the *Prolegomena* to the seventh edition which deals with the laws to be observed in the formation of the text; but in the meantime Tischendorf had seen reason to change his views on many points. The discovery of the *Codex Sinaiticus* induced him to assign more weight to the testimony of the most ancient documents, and less to internal evidence and individual judgment in deciding between conflicting readings; and not unnaturally he was disposed to rate the value of his own discovery somewhat higher than other scholars have done, and to shut his eyes to its peculiar blemishes and errors. This change in his views is expressed in the *Prolegomena* to the third edition of the *Synopsis Evangelica* (1871) as follows:—

'Though we preferred the few most ancient Greek manuscripts to the vast multitude of other documents, we did not conform our text to their evidence without applying certain laws of probability in the case of each reading. . . . But since it has pleased God in His providence to augment the stores of Christian literature by a treasure of unparalleled value [*i.e.* the *Codex Sinaiticus*], we were of necessity compelled once more

to exam
This d
text d
judgm
demon
estima
as to e
possibi
rule of
regard
therefo
text w
author

Th
the Co
eighth
culars,
Tisch
nents
this fa
lead to

Th
of his
collect
compr
these

No
that p
to the
spite
in the
which
matici
by Ti
of the
the N

Ar
appen
gelles
parts

It
reject
Testam
the di
Arch

D
the gr
literat
ences
Tisch
to the

to examine what considerations are of the most importance in criticism. This deliberation led us so far to change our previous plan as to edit a text depending entirely on ancient documents, with less regard to the judgment of opinion as to the probability of readings. For it may be demonstrated by a multitude of examples how easy it is to go wrong in estimating this probability, for scarcely any result of opinion is so certain as to exclude all possibility of contradiction. Certainly it would be impossible even for the most skilful editors to construct an edition by the rule of probability which would be satisfactory to the majority and be regarded as everywhere approximating to the apostolic original. And therefore it seems most to the advantage of Christian literature to edit a text which should throughout follow the most ancient and approved authorities.'

The result of this change of view, and of the natural influence of the Codex Sinaiticus on the judgment of its discoverer, was that the eighth edition differed from the seventh in a vast number of particulars, estimated by Dr. Scrivener at 3,369, by Dr. Gregory at 3,592. Tischendorf was charged with inconsistency; and some of the opponents of the modern school of textual criticism have appealed to this fact in order to discredit its results, and to show that its principles lead to no certain conclusions.

The truth is that Tischendorf's text is the least satisfactory part of his work. His life was spent, and most usefully spent, in the collection of materials for the construction of the text; but for a comprehensive survey and discrimination of the relative value of these materials it is necessary to look elsewhere.

No alternative indeed was possible to Dr. Gregory but to reprint that portion of the *Prolegomena* of the seventh edition which relates to the formation of the text, and let Tischendorf speak for himself, in spite of the change which we know had come over his opinions. But in the rest of the volume he has added much from his own researches which will be of the greatest value. The exhaustive chapter '*De Grammaticis*' contains a complete discussion of the orthography adopted by Tischendorf in accordance with the oldest manuscripts, as well as of the grammatical forms and syntactical peculiarities to be found in the New Testament, which will be of great service to the student.

An elaborate account of the various printed editions, to which is appended a collation of the text of Tischendorf with those of Tregelles and Professors Westcott and Hort, is also one of the useful parts of the volume.

It may be noted as a point of general interest that Dr. Gregory rejects the common opinion which assigns the division of the New Testament into chapters to Cardinal Hugh de S. Cher, and believes the division to have been the work of Stephen Langton, the famous Archbishop of Canterbury, though certain proof is still wanting.

Dr. Gregory has performed his laborious and difficult task with the greatest diligence. He has carefully gone through the immense literature of the subject, and gives a large number of valuable references to all that has been written on every point. The editor of Tischendorf's *Prolegomena* belongs, it is scarcely necessary to say, to the modern school of critics, and speaks in the highest terms of

the labours of Drs. Westcott and Hort. At the same time he fully recognizes the value of the labours of Dr. Scrivener and Dean Burgon in collating and cataloguing manuscripts. His work supplements, but will not in this country supersede, the Introductions of Dr. Scrivener and Drs. Westcott and Hort. To the first of these works the student will still turn as the most convenient source of information concerning the materials for the formation of the text, to the second for the most elaborate discussion (whether he agrees with it or not) of the methods to be employed in the use of those materials; while Dr. Gregory's volume will supply a large number of additional details and valuable references not to be found in either of the other works.

Modern Criticism and Clement's Epistles to Virgins. By J. M. COTTERILL. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1884.)

THIS work is a sequel to the author's *Peregrinus Proteus*.¹ Since the appearance of the article on the 'Epistle to Diognetus' in the *Church Quarterly Review* in 1877 he has been engaged in a long and patient examination of a certain group of documents, which has 'forced upon him the conclusion' that their origin cannot be traced to an earlier date than the revival of learning of the fifteenth century. Having dealt with the Epistle to Diognetus and the Epistles ascribed to Clemens Romanus in *Peregrinus Proteus*, he now gives us an application of the same method to the Syriac 'Epistles on Virginity.' The investigation shows by its industry and research the importance attached by the writer to the result at which he has arrived, which may be thus described:—

'In addition to the other kinds of literary forgery with which scholars have hitherto been familiar there appeared at a certain era, shortly after the invention of printing, an entirely new species, which might be called "the lexicographical forgery," in which the author, drawing from the inexhaustible resources of his retentive memory, succeeded in weaving together a number of "interesting" words and phrases, gathered out of early Christian and pagan treatises into a homogeneous whole, with no other object but that of accomplishing a grand literary feat and exhibiting his own powers of imitation or parody.'

Henry Stephens, fresh from the colossal labours of *Stephani Thesaurus*, was equal to the production of any number of these documents. Mr. Cotterill examines the text of the Epistles of Clemens to the Corinthians, and extracts words and phrases which are found to have strange affinities in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius, in the *Evangelium Thomæ*, in the *Mors Peregrini* ascribed to Lucian, and Aristophanes—in fact, in such an array of authors as could only be present to the mind of a Herculean scholar of the age of the revival of learning. To follow such an argument requires of itself a mind of a peculiar constitution or training. Hitherto we have supposed spurious works

¹ *Peregrinus Proteus: An Investigation into certain Relations subsisting between De Morte Peregrini, the two Epistles of Clement to the Corinthians, the Epistle to Diognetus, the Bibliotheca of Photius, and other writings.* Edinburgh, 1879.

to be
been
anony
author
lated
name,
misbel
literar
Christ
ter wh
extrac
to the
will be
pagan
Cleme
Th
1752.
of Sac
Epistle
from t
Epistle
if we
Jerom
sive, a
thians.
'Have
impos
58-9),
Epistle
whole
the au
Durha
board
Christ
bear th
than t
neither
Virgin
quotes
sevent
have l
examin
were w
'Th
tions in
themse
worth
are, m
less.
and cu
suppor

to be either (a) treatises ascribed to an illustrious author, who has been confounded with an obscure writer of the same name, or (b) anonymous works to which transcribers have added the name of an author from their own conjecture, or (c) works deliberately interpolated with the view to obtain for them the authority of some great name, or (d) fabrications in the interest of some heresy or form of misbelief. A forgery, with no other object but that of rhetorical or literary display, reappearing in the next generation in another part of Christendom as a relic of Apostolic times, has a paradoxical character which demands more evidence for its acceptance than can be extracted from verbal coincidences. Of the weight to be attached to these coincidences opinions will doubtless differ: to many there will be an appearance of incongruity in importing passages from coarse pagan satire to illustrate the composition of such a treatise as the Clementine Epistle to the Corinthians.

The two Epistles on Virginity were published by Wetstein in 1752. The history of their discovery may be found in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, October 1856. The writer says, 'While the Epistle to the Corinthians has been generally known and referred to from the earliest ages of Christianity, a dead silence respecting the Epistles on Virginity reigns throughout the Greek and Latin Fathers, if we except two disputed and doubtful passages in Epiphanius and Jerome.' He then argues that neither of these passages is conclusive, and that both may have referred to the Epistles of the Corinthians. The article, however, concludes by leaving the question open: 'Have we here a genuine production of an apostolic man or the imposture of some unprincipled deceiver?' Mr. Cotterill says (pp. 58-9), 'Dr. Lightfoot and the majority of critics deny that the Epistles to Virgins were written by Clement of Rome, though the whole of the external testimony, as far as it is known, is in favour of the authorship of Clement.' Mr. Cotterill accuses the Bishop of Durham of critical inconsistency in throwing this testimony overboard 'because their contents do not square with the picture of early Christian times which his fancy has painted.' But he thinks they bear the stamp of high antiquity, and cannot be placed much later than the middle of the second century. Mr. Cotterill argues that neither Epiphanius nor Jerome had any knowledge of the Epistles to Virgins now in our hands. In proof of the late origin of the latter he quotes the testimony of Antiochus Palæstinensis, a writer of the seventh century, in whose homilies whole sections of both epistles have been found. 'The evidence which his pages, when carefully examined, undesignedly supply proves that the Epistles to Virgins were written after the homilies.' He thus sums up his conclusion:—

'The Epistles to Virgins are absolutely without value. The quotations in them out of Holy Scripture can be best read in the sacred pages themselves. Besides these quotations there is not a sentence that is worth reading, or if there is it can be found elsewhere. These Epistles are, moreover, as seventh-century (or later) documents, perfectly harmless. They will not be quoted any more in illustration of the manners and customs of the primitive Church. They will not again be used to support the canon of the New Testament.'

Mr. Cotterill adds a few remarks on the mistake of relying solely upon internal evidence for fixing the date of a document, and maintains that he has not urged the argument from verbal coincidences to an illegitimate extent, or any further than his opponents have urged it in dealing with the author of *Supernatural Religion*. The case which he has made out against the antiquity of the Epistles to Virgins will appear to many to be stronger than the points alleged against Diognetus and the Epistle to the Corinthians; but in order to substantiate his peculiar theory of literary forgeries he will require some collateral evidence other than that of verbal coincidences in order to win for it general acceptance.

The Atonement Viewed in the Light of Certain Modern Difficulties; being the Hulsean Lectures for 1883, 1884. By the Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A. (Cambridge: Bell and Co., 1884.)

THE value of the volume before us must not be estimated by its size. Mr. Lias has succeeded in compressing into less than a hundred and fifty pages an immense amount of material, and we cordially recommend his work as containing an admirable summary and excellent introduction to larger works treating of the vast subject with which it deals. It was of course impossible to deal fully with such a theme as the Atonement in the short space of four lectures, and the author has wisely not attempted to do anything of the kind, but his book will be found to give for those who have neither the time nor the opportunity for deeper or more protracted study a very careful and thoughtful analysis of the different theories which have from time to time found support in the Christian Church, while it shows how much may be said to be *de fide*, and how much must be set down as mere theory, opinion, and the like.

But the special claim which the writer has upon our gratitude is raised by the manner in which he has dealt with modern difficulties, and the widespread perplexities which are often felt even where not expressed. Doubts, we know, are sometimes driven in, and seated the firmer through want of sympathy on the part of those to whom they are expressed. Mr. Lias, however, while he is strong, or rather *because* he is strong in his own position, is ready to give a patient hearing to those who are troubled in mind, and is willing to examine afresh with them the great mystery of the Atonement, in the hope that by so doing he may remove some of their misgivings and misconceptions. He starts with them from the beginning, and leads them on gently until he shows that in many cases the particular form of the doctrine to which they took exception was either their own creation or the invention of a crude theology, while the teaching of the Church has been all the while free from the charge which was hastily brought against it. This is clearly the right method to employ, and we heartily thank Mr. Lias for the boldness and ability with which he has handled his subject; and we think that his work is likely to prove successful in answering the purpose with which it was written. It will certainly be found useful by those who from circumstances or position have to endeavour, as far as in them lies, to satisfy the wants

and m
might
trouble
win the
remark
Lias sa
'they a
who ha
ishing
scoffers
should
by an i
propitia
A gen
gravity
when th
If, then
that is
been sh
satisfac
Divine
that of
exactin
if we c
been fr
we may
been lo

This
book, a
I. cont
Atonem
onward
to them
propitia
concept
remissi
meanin
differen
compact
his inv
work to
list of v
complete
McLea
in the l
touch—
as Mr.
to view
is to so
cluding
for it is
Divine

VOL.

and meet the difficulties of others, and, further, it is a work which might well be placed in the hands of those who are themselves troubled and perplexed. The sympathetic tone of the lectures will win their attention, and they will find the volume singularly free from remarks that are calculated to repel or excite their prejudice. Mr. Lias says with justice on p. 12 that

'they are no carping or sneering sceptics, but souls deeply in earnest, who have failed to see how the justice of God can be vindicated by punishing the innocent and letting the guilty go free. They are no hardened scoffers who have been unable to discern why the Divinity of Christ should depend on the theory that an infinite offence can only be expiated by an infinite penalty. And yet, on the other hand, a Christianity without propitiation is no Christianity at all. It is not even common morality. A general amnesty to offenders who have never comprehended the gravity of their offence is a simple invitation to offend again. It is only when the majesty of law is duly recognized that pardon can be granted. If, then, we can show that it is not the Scripture doctrine of propitiation that is at fault, but that the centre of gravity of the Christian scheme has been shifted by modern theories of the Atonement; if we can show that satisfaction to Divine justice has taken the place of the restoration of the Divine Image in fallen man, that the doctrine of propitiation rests upon that of Christ's Godhead, and not Christ's Godhead upon the necessity of exacting an adequate penalty either from the offender or his substitute; if we can persuade men that Christ's incarnation, not His death, has been from the first the pivot upon which the Gospel scheme has revolved—we may perhaps do something to restore that faith which has so unhappily been lost.'

This extract defines with tolerable clearness the purpose of the book, and, following out the line of thought thus suggested, Lecture I. contains a rapid summary of the objections to the doctrine of the Atonement as commonly stated since the days of Faustus Socinus onwards; and then in Lecture II. the way is prepared for the answers to them by the examination of the teaching of Scripture regarding propitiation, ending with some good remarks on the prevalent misconceptions connected with such words as Mediator, atonement, remission, and the unfairness of those who would unduly limit their meaning. The third lecture is devoted to an historical survey of the different theories of propitiation held within the Church, giving in a compact form much of the material collected by Mr. Oxenham in his invaluable work on the Catholic doctrine of the Atonement, a work to which Mr. Lias' book might well form an introduction. The list of writers starts with S. Clement of Rome, and seems to be fairly complete, being brought right down to our own day, and ending with McLeod Campbell, and Godet. The fourth lecture touches—in the limits of a single lecture it was impossible to do more than touch—on some out of the many different aspects of propitiation; for, as Mr. Lias rightly points out, 'the various lights in which we ought to view a transaction so momentous must be practically infinite.' It is to some of these that the reader's attention is invited in the concluding lecture. No one of them is presented as excluding another, for it is believed that they all have their place in the *rationale* of so Divine a mystery.

'The true attitude of the believer in relation to the unfolding of the great Divine purpose of atonement for sin ought not to be, "See how simple it is. I will explain it to you in a very few words," but rather, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!"' (p. 70).

There is, by the way, a suggestive foot-note on this passage, drawing attention to the evidential value of this way of presenting the subject. 'The doctrine becomes not a chain, but a network. If one single link of a chain be found defective, the chain is broken. If one or two meshes of the net give way, the net still holds.' The thought is a good one, and will repay following up. Altogether Mr. Lias has produced a really helpful introduction to the study of a subject of overwhelming importance, and has uttered a well-timed protest against the narrowness of so much popular teaching and the defective character of many modern theories.

A Commentary on the Office for the Ministration of Holy Baptism. Illustrated from Holy Scripture, Ancient Liturgies, and the Writings of Catholic Fathers, Doctors, and Divines. By the Rev. W. H. PEREIRA, M.A., M.R.I.A., formerly Scholar of Trinity College, Dublin. (London: Rivingtons, 1884.)

OUR clerical readers—and, we much fear, some of their hearers also—must be conscious of the danger of the human mind getting into grooves of thought, in such wise as to become too uniform, and consequently lacking in freshness and variety. Then comes the counter-temptation to be startling and original, too often without sufficient regard to soundness or to reverence. The reasons adduced are not of such a character as to deserve that rare praise which Shakespeare's Sir Nathaniel gives to those of Holofernes, as being 'learned without opinion and strange without heresy.'

Now, the volume before us is just one of those which is well calculated to help the teacher in his efforts to escape this twofold peril. The careful student of its pages will have bathed his spirit in a strengthening and refreshing river of waters, and the gain will not be confined to himself alone, for in truth spiritual gain never is, never can be, so limited.

M. Pereira's volume is an octavo of nearly 350 closely-printed pages. It is exceedingly well arranged; and the author has wisely treated, in an appendix, several incidental questions of deep interest and importance, such as, for example, those concerning post-baptismal sin, the probable meaning of S. Paul's words being 'baptized for the dead,' and the validity of lay baptism. He has really aimed at being the scribe, who is likened unto the householder 'which bringeth forth out of his treasures things new and old.'

We despair of being able to give an idea of the effect of a book of extracts by the selection of a specimen of those extracts, but the headings of a few of the chapters or sections may suggest some notion of the fulness and the practical character of Mr. Pereira's work—'The Sacrament of Holy Baptism, the Foundation of the Spiritual

Life
of A
Med

cont
alm
thru
poss
that
spon

L

ger.

writi
whic

was
tism.

are a
we c

may
have

M

and
appr

Pere

extre
slip.

his o
They

Morl

The

J

THIS

from

in a

thoug

allow

manner

be cor

in A.I.

agreer

Old C

additi

tically

Dr

He ar

the Ni

becam

that th

Life,' 'Source of its Grace, the Incarnation of Christ,' 'The Presence of Angels,' 'Cautions and Warnings,' 'The Divine Exemplar,' 'Select Meditations and Prayers.'

It has been said that the discussions arising out of the Gorham controversy in 1850 tended to make Anglican divinity for a season almost too replete with teachings concerning holy baptism, and to thrust the earlier sacrament into undue prominence. It is not impossible that the danger may now lie in the opposite direction, and that we may be inclined to think too little of the blessings and responsibilities connected with the sacred font.

M. Pereira's compilation is a welcome protest against such danger. It will prove useful in many ways. While we were engaged in writing this short notice a letter reached us asking for something which might be laid before a gentleman brought up as a Baptist, who was making inquiry about ancient practice in respect of infant baptism. Now, although, as the preface informs us, the authorities cited are adduced rather to confirm and illustrate than to prove the faith, we cannot but trust that the study of the section on infant baptism may be found highly beneficial in such cases as that to which we have referred.

Most sincerely do we trust that this 'growth of many years' study,' and 'solace of not a few periods of sorrow and ill-health,' may be appreciated by many readers. For our own part we tender M. Pereira our most grateful thanks. Just because our author seems extremely accurate we call attention, *more criticorum*, to a single slip. The lamented Dr. Neale would not have liked to have seen his own name *only* appended to the beautiful lines given on p. 292. They are a translation, or rather a paraphrase, from Bernard de Morlaix.

The Nicene Creed and the Filioque. By THOMAS RICHEY, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, G.T.S. (New York: E. and J. B. Young and Co., 1884.)

THIS booklet consists of an article reprinted, with notes and appendix, from the *Church Eclectic*, and it succeeds in putting an old question in a new light to a considerable extent. The usual tendency of thought among Anglican writers about the *Filioque* has been to allow that, while the doctrine it expresses is undoubtedly true, the manner of its introduction into an Œcumenical Creed by what must be considered an inferior authority—viz. the Third Council of Toledo, in A.D. 589—cannot be wholly defended. Thus in Art. 3 of the agreement arrived at (in 1875) by the Bonn Conference, held between Old Catholics, Orientals, and Anglicans, it is allowed that 'the addition 'Filioque' to the symbol did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner.'

Dr. Richey takes a step further and traverses this conclusion. He argues that the Council of Constantinople, which added largely to the Nicene symbol, was itself 'a purely Eastern Council,' and only became Œcumenical by subsequent acceptance of its conclusions, and that the addition of 'Filioque' at Toledo was made under precisely the

same circumstances as the Constantinople decrees, and is therefore (we presume Dr. Richey infers) legitimate and regular.

A single question will suffice to shatter this theory.

The Constantinopolitan Council was rendered Œcumenical, it seems, by the 'subsequent reception of their decrees by the Church Universal.' Would, then, Dr. Richey argue that the 'subsequent reception' of *its* decree by the Church Universal, or, at all events, by the whole Western Church, rendered the Toletan Synod Œcumenical also? Evidently not; and this *reductio ad impossibile* must, we think, prove to Dr. Richey that the parallel he has drawn between the two does not run quite upon all fours. The fact is that no Council (however orthodox soever its creed be) can possibly attain to Œcumenical rank unless it be, in the first place, largely representative. It need not be in the first place universal; we doubt if any of the great Synods have ever been absolutely universal *ab incepto*. But it must be substantially a representation of a considerable portion of the Church in more than one patriarchate, and not of a mere subordinate section, as was the case with the Toletan Synod. Then, secondly, there must be some *definite question* before the Church at the time: some heresy to be combated, some point of doctrine to be decided, and the Synod must be summoned with a special regard to such question, and have substantially a *mandat* from the Church to deal with it. This was the case with the earlier great Councils. Indeed, we may put the condition of Œcumenicity in a simpler form still: a Council is Œcumenical because it has an Œcumenical question (that is, a question which immediately concerns the whole Church) to deal with, and decides it in a manner which the Church Universal recognizes and accepts as orthodox. Now, here again the Toletan Synod fails to stand the test. The question of the Procession of the Holy Spirit was of course of Œcumenical concern. But the Synod was not *sui juris* in deciding it. It had no *mandat*, so to speak; and its unauthorized action has created a dangerous division in the Church, of which we have not even now seen the end. It might have resisted its own local disturbers of the Faith by local measures. To tamper with the Creed of the whole Church in order to do so was like felling a tree in order to get rid of a rotten limb. Such a liberty of altering a symbol which is under the guardianship of the whole Church has never been conceded to a section, and never will be; and we must regard the assumption as just as 'irregular' at Toledo, although the doctrine defined is orthodox, as it was irregular (and also heterodox) at Trent.

Suppose that Germanus and Lupus had ventured to add an article to the Creed to forbid the error of Pelagianism?

We therefore are of opinion that Dr. Richey's plea upon this point cannot stand, and that the received opinion of theologians is well founded. But that need not prevent our acknowledging the learning, care, and ability with which his essay is written; his summary of reasons for holding the doctrine of the Double Procession to be of very great importance and value is especially powerful and suggestive.

sac
the
Fat
Sor
esse
ano
bes
cor
of t
Hu
the
with
sub
den
and
Chr
Som
sion
Hin
pow
beir
God
God
Spin
poin
treat
doct
fear
very
from
tion
Ghos
He c
(rap
from

A R

THIS
justi
rapid
It is
foreh
able
with
exten
may
write

Take the following for an example :—

'Theodore of Mopsuestia, with a view to undermine the distinctively sacramental element in Christianity, undertook positively to deny that the Holy Ghost is *of* the Son, and is His *very* Own, even as He is of the Father. It will be seen at a glance that if the Holy Ghost is not *of* the Son, and is not His *very* Own, then the Son is not present in His Own essential nature in the Church and the sacraments, but operates through another as an agent or instrument, and accordingly cannot be said to bestow Himself in His Own Divine human nature that we may be incorporated into Him. If the Holy Ghost be not proper to the Godhead of the Son, as He is to the Godhead of the Father, then the Divine Humanity is not the proper source of eternal life to the sons of men, and the Incarnation ceases to be an eternal fact. Nestorius joined hands with Theodore of Mopsuestia in denying that the Holy Spirit was consubstantial with the "form of a servant." Nestorianism, again, in its denial of the hypostatic union and of the consubstantiality of the Second and Third Persons of the Godhead, strikes at the root of sacramental Christianity. For if the Holy Ghost be not of the very nature of the Son, even as He is of the Father, then the sacraments are not "extensions of the Incarnation," by means of which Christ communicates Himself, Body, Soul, and Divinity, to us, but, as Calvin teaches, energizing powers of which the Holy Spirit is Himself the Source, the Incarnation being no longer operative as a living agent. This attack upon the proper Godhead of the Eternal Son, and the proper bestowal of Himself as God Incarnate, through the agency of His Own very Spirit, and not the Spirit of another, called forth full and clear declarations on the disputed points both East and West. John Cassian in the West replied in his treatise on the Incarnation. S. Cyril in the East attacked the new doctrine both right and left. Up to this time the Greek Fathers, out of fear of infringing upon the traditional notion of the Monarchy, had been very guarded in their language, and left the question of the derivation from the Son an open one ; but now S. Cyril does not hesitate, in opposition to Theodore of Mopsuestia and his disciple, to declare that the Holy Ghost holds the same *essential* relation to the Divinity of the Son which He does to the Divinity of the Father, and proceeds not simply from (*παρά*) the Son, but out (*ἐκ*) of Him by way of derivation, as He does from the Father' (p. 37).

A Religious Encyclopedia ; or, Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology. Based on the *Real-Encyklopädie* of Herzog, Plitt, and Hauck. Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Vol. III. (Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark, 1884.)

THIS is the concluding volume of the work, and it is the merest justice to those concerned in its issue to describe it as having been rapidly and (at all events as to the later volumes) creditably produced. It is true that the great lines of the work were already marked out beforehand, and that a vast number of able and lengthy articles were available as material to the editors. They have not been content, however, with simply condensing and translating these. The very considerable extent to which new matter has been embodied in the present work may be gathered from the fact that whereas the whole number of writers who have contributed to its pages is four hundred and forty-

six, one hundred and seventy-four of these are peculiar to the reproduction, not having contributed to the original 'Herzog' at all. More than one-third, therefore, almost one-half, of the contributors are American; for of these only thirteen are British (if we have counted rightly), mostly Presbyterian or Nonconformist. It is an exception to the general rule of the Encyclopædia that a Nonconformist divine was requested to write many of the articles on historical personages, prelates or leaders, of the Church of England; and he has fulfilled the task in none too friendly a spirit, as was to be expected.

We are, perhaps, no sufficient judges of the comparative importance of persons and things American, or we might venture to express surprise at the prominence constantly given to what seem to us comparatively obscure persons and subjects. It would perhaps be invidious to specify instances of the former, but with regard to the latter, we should hardly have thought it worth while to fill thirty-four columns with a *catalogue raisonné* of 'Theological Seminaries,' giving minute details of the history of each. In England, while there are publications such as *kalendars*, directories, and the like, in which that kind of information is to be had by those who need it, we should not devote the precious space of an encyclopædia of theology to diffusing it. Bishop Thirlwall is dismissed in thirty-six lines; 'Thiuluck, Friedrich August,' occupies three and a half entire columns—perhaps eight or ten times as much. 'Tongues, Gift of' is weighty and suggestive, though brief, and is well worth careful reading, while Landerer's article on 'Thomas of Aquino' is masterly, and that on 'Thorah,' by Lehrer, contains many curious details.

Notwithstanding errors of omission and commission the work is one of great value and deserving every respect. It has derived something of the haziness of German 'speculative' theology from its prototype or progenitor, Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, while it has adopted the sectarianism of American popular religion as its special standpoint. These two facts must be borne in mind in referring to its pages; but nevertheless the work is creditable to those responsible for it, and in particular it forms a monument *ære perennius* to the learning, judgment, and industry of the editor in chief, Dr. Schaff, whom we may congratulate upon the successful completion of his task.

The Hymn 'Te Deum Laudamus': Observations upon its Composition and Structure, with special regard to the Use, Liturgical and Choral, of this and other Canticles and Psalms, and to the True Character of the Chant. (London: Rivingtons, 1884.)

MR. POTT (whose name appears at the end of the preface, although not on the title page) has done well to publish this thoughtful and suggestive paper. Its primary object is, not to discuss questions of history and authorship, but rather to investigate the structure of the *Te Deum* and other canticles with a view to the improvement of their musical renderings and 'the reconsideration of some of our traditions and methods.' The greater part of the essay is concerned

with the *Te Deum*, and the writer is certainly successful in indicating the true connexion of many of the couplets, and in pointing out whereon the emphasis should rest; but it appears very doubtful whether (granting the correctness of his theory) effect could ever be given to it without a new rendering, or at least a 'revised version,' of the canticle. It has always been to us a matter for regret that the version with which we are all familiar departs so widely from the wonderfully vigorous old English renderings current before the Reformation. Those given by Mr. Maskell in the third volume of the *Monumenta Ritualia* (2nd edition) are far more forcible than the one which stands in our Prayer Book. Not only are they much nearer to the original, but they have also the great merit of preserving in its proper place at the commencement of the sentence the emphatic 'Thee' with which almost all the earlier versions commence.

'Thee, God, we preisen : Thee, Lord, we knowlechin.

Thee, endelese Fader : all the earth worschipheth.

To Thee alle angels, to Thee heuenes : and alle maner poweres,

To Thee cherubyn and ceraphin : crien with voice withouten stenting.'

(*Mon. Rit.* iii. p. 239.)

Even, however, if there were no difficulty about the rendering we should still be inclined to question whether Mr. Pott's theory of antiphony would hold good throughout. He is obliged sometimes to use a little violence in order to force the verses into it. His view, it should be said, is this:—

'Every verse, as it is usually printed, whether in Latin or English, is really only a half-verse containing but one complete sentence, which is really the parallel to the preceding or following verse as the case may be; but having been thus taken as a whole verse, it has then been cut by a colon, or "point," into two open grammarless and meaningless quarters to serve as versicle and response. Each two verses as printed (not reckoning vv. 11, 12, 13) should be brought together into one, with the point placed between them, so that each such complete verse would consist, as, with rare exceptions, it does throughout the Psalms in our Prayer Book version, of two parallel and responsive sentences' (p. 17).

Thus on verses 7, 8, 9, 10 we are told that

'in these verses the antiphonal responsiveness is very marked and beautiful. It is a case of contrasted or antithetic parallelism. The "Apostles" of the new dispensation being set in antithesis to the "prophets" of the old, the "martyrs" triumphant to the "Church" militant. This is recognized in the following paraphrase from a beautiful old meditation on the *Te Deum* of the fifteenth century, printed at length by Mr. Thomson, which thus interprets these verses: "As al these joyethe before Thee . . . in the high Chirche of glory : on likewise we . . . to Thee give praysinge . . . as fightyng Chirche in erthe'" (p. 24).

This is attractive at first sight, but a glance at the original Latin will show anyone that the first three of these verses are meant to be taken together as a triplet, there being no verb expressed until the third (exactly as verses 1 and 2, 3 and 4 really form two sets of triplets, each clause beginning with 'Te' in the first set and 'Tibi' in

the second). Nor is it clear that the ancient paraphrase which Mr. Pott quotes took his view, for 'al these' may perfectly well be taken as referring back to the apostles and prophets instead of being limited to the martyrs.

So also, if the generally accepted belief as to the composition of the *Gloria Patri* be true (and we know of no reason to doubt it), history is against the theory that 'the doxology is but one whole verse' (p. 36); for the answer, at any rate in its present form, is many years later than the first clause.

Still, in spite of the fact that we cannot follow Mr. Pott on every point, we cordially recommend his book as likely to prove useful in leading to a more intelligent rendering of the canticles. It contains some interesting suggestions with regard to the manner of singing the *Benedicite*, and at the close of the volume the reader will find all the canticles 'carefully printed, pointed, and accented in accordance with their poetical structures for antiphonal chanting.' Our limits are too narrow to allow of any comments upon these, but we cannot close this notice without a word or two on the section which treats of the intention or sense in which we use the New Testament canticles. The writer, like many others before him, is puzzled by the ninth verse of the *Benedictus*, and fairly confesses that he knows not how to say with any reality, 'Thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare His ways.' But surely the collect for the third Sunday in Advent might help him. For ourselves, we never cease to rejoice that the hymn stands in our Prayer Book entire and not mutilated, as in the American book; and we feel that the last part of it is a *most* helpful reminder to all 'ministers and stewards' of God's mysteries, who, like the Baptist, are prophets of the Highest, and are charged to 'prepare and make ready His way.'

Lastly, in all this section we greatly desiderate some reference to Hooker's splendid vindication of the use of the New Testament canticles (*E. P. Book V*, c. xl.) Mr. Pott would have done well if he had turned to it. It is full of beautiful thoughts from beginning to end, and not the least beautiful is that which is contained in its final words, viz. the suggestion that 'by often using their words in such manner our minds are daily more and more inured with their affections.'

How is the Divinity of Jesus Depicted in the Gospels and Epistles?
By the Rev. THOMAS WHITELAW, M.A., D.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1883.)

THIS ably-written little work is a handbook of New Testament Christology. It recites and presents in an abbreviated form the chief doctrinal positions with regard to the Person of Christ which are taken up in the New Testament, and will be useful alike to the teacher and the student of theology. It is somewhat technical and dry in wording, very much matter having been compressed into a small compass, and many authors cited. A good deal of accurate industry, though rather of the paste-and-scissors order, must have been expended in its compilation. The sole point where (as far as we have seen) it is open to

serio
appa
form
and
he u
esser
head
respe
avoi
his o
and
here

How

Dr.
throp
atten
own
gatio
ent.
at St
Hous
into t
the M
contr
belie
howe
verse
He v
denie
outs
broth
of In
the c
schoo
says,
plain
hims
there
Dr. J
cool
stated
last
'read
inter
shoul
an E
Inde
taugh

serious criticism is in chap. v. sect. v. par. 3, where the author apparently criticizes as unsatisfactory the usually received doctrinal formulas showing the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. The tone of the chapter preceding it (iv.), in which he uses unguarded and almost heterodox language respecting 'the essential inferiority of the Second to the First Person of the God-head' (p. 73), is also far from satisfactory; and a fuller and more respectful employment of the Catholic terminology would have avoided this. But Dr. Whitelaw does not usually come forward in his own person, but hides himself behind 'it is asserted,' 'it is argued,' and the like; so that we are uncertain how much of the language here referred to is intended as an expression of his own views.

Howard the Philanthropist and his Friends. By JOHN STOUGH-
TON, D.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1884.)

DR. STUGHTON is anxious to include the name of the great philanthropist in the hagiology of the Independents. Sixty years ago an attempt was made to claim him as an Anabaptist. Dr. Stoughton's own sect certainly has a better case than that of the rival Congregationalist sect. Howard's father was a Calvinist and an Independent. Howard himself was the member of an Independent society at Stoke Newington, and when 'the Church' of the Old Meeting House at Bedford, of which John Bunyan had been minister, split into two rival Anabaptist and Pædobaptist 'Churches,' Howard joined the latter, whom the former characterized as 'Separatists,' and he contributed to the erection of a new meeting house, now known, we believe, as Howard Chapel. Howard's Independency and Calvinism, however, were exceedingly thin. They were the products of the perverse *ἀγνοία* of his ignorant father and equally ignorant teachers. He worked himself free from his hereditary Calvinism, and practically denied its contra-human principles by his actual contact with men outside the narrow ring of 'the elect,' and his recognition of the brotherhood of humanity—a conception utterly alien to the founders of Independency. In his earlier foreign journals it is easy to trace the effect of the bigoted education which he had received at the school to which most of the opulent Dissenters of London, as Dr. Aikin says, at that time sent their sons. In his later years Howard complained to Dr. Aikin, with a warmth rare in his expressions concerning himself, of the character of this school, saying that, after staying there for seven years he 'left it not fairly taught one thing.' Dr. J. B. Brown, the biographer whose labours Dr. Stoughton has coolly appropriated, with only the shabby apology of a recognition, states that 'in the last request he ever made, and indeed nearly the last words his lips pronounced,' he begged that the admiral would 'read the burial service of the Church of England over his body at his interment.' This came partly from his dread lest the Russian priests should conduct his funeral; but it shows that he was then much of an Englishman and very little of an Independent; for the fathers of Independency, as may be proved by a long catena of quotations, taught that it was 'unlawful,' as John Cotton puts it, 'to pray, or to

join with, or seem to join with, such devised prescript forms of prayers,' and they regarded the burial office as one of the most anti-Christian portions of the Book of Common Prayer, on account of its implication that our blessed Lord had died and risen again for every man, and not for 'the elect' only. Dr. Stoughton claims in his advertisement to have supplied what has hitherto been lacking in all former biographies of Howard, by giving an account of 'his religious peculiarities' and 'his ecclesiastical relations.' We find nothing in his book, however, even in these provinces, which has not been already related with equal fullness and with much more tolerance and sobriety by Dr. Aikin or J. B. Brown. All the details which Dr. Stoughton professes to have gathered from old periodicals of the last century had been collected and cited by Brown. It is amusing to read at the bottom of one of Dr. Stoughton's pages his virtuous indignation at the literary dishonesty of the late Mr. Hepworth Dixon's *John Howard and the Prison World of Europe*. 'It appears,' exclaims he, 'that Dixon was indebted to Field for his knowledge of "the original and authentic document" incorporated in his memoir.' What reader to whom the subject is new would imagine that Dr. Stoughton himself is 'indebted' to Aikin, Brown, Field, and Dixon for 'every original and authentic document incorporated in his memoir'? The story of the outbreak of 'the dissidence of Dissent' in the Old Meeting House at Bedford, which Dr. Stoughton relates as if it were his own discovery, unearthed by what he pleases to call his 'studies,' was related in the fullest detail in 1818 by J. B. Brown, whose narrative Dr. Stoughton appropriates without a single grateful note of reference. Hepworth Dixon, at his worst, was never so bad as this. Where Stoughton contradicts Brown it is Brown who is right and he who is wrong, as in the description of Howard's relations with the interesting anti-Calvinistic Quakers. He even omits points interesting to Dissenters which Brown has introduced. He tells us that Howard gave a new pulpit to the Old Meeting House at Bedford; but he does not tell us, what Brown adds, that the old pulpit from which Bunyan had preached was cut up into pieces and distributed as relics to the admirers of Bunyan in Bedford and the surrounding villages.

Dr. Stoughton's account of the Bedford election, when Howard and Whitbread were fellow candidates, seems to have been compiled to please the Liberation Society. He tries to give it the character of a contest between Dissent and 'the High Church party.' He writes, 'Howard was a Nonconformist, and Nonconformists, though admissible to Parliament, laboured under disadvantages, and were objects of dislike to the High Church party.' Howard was not a Nonconformist, nor did he call himself by that title. He was a Dissenter, and that was the title which he gave himself in a letter to his ex-pastor, Mr. Symonds of Bedford, in a letter about the election. His colleague Whitbread might fairly be called a Nonconformist, for though he was a Churchman, he was also a patron and supporter of Dissenting meeting houses. After the election, at which Howard was defeated, it 'was insinuated,' as J. B. Brown says, who was the possessor of Howard's

MSS., that he was 'left entirely to the support of the Presbyterians, Moravians, and other sectaries.' Brown, from whom Dr. Stoughton derives all that he knows about the Bedford election, asserts that 'this calumny is as groundless as it is false.' That the election turned upon the relative fitness of Churchmen or Dissenters to represent Bedford in the House of Commons is a pious invention of Dr. Stoughton. He unblushingly declares, in the teeth of Brown's statements to the contrary, that 'the High Church party were prepared to employ all possible methods to prevent the return of a Dissenting candidate.' The very contrary is true; for Brown says that 'amongst the most active supporters of Mr. Howard's interests at the election were not only many of the staunchest members, but several of the most orthodox ministers of the Established Church in Bedford and its neighbourhood, the grounds of the severe contest being perfectly distinct from any difference that might prevail amongst the electors as to their religious opinions.' Dr. Stoughton must have read the pages which contain these statements, for he has borrowed from them whatever suited the market for which his compilation is intended. Yet he dares to pretend that it was between 'Nonconformists' and the 'High Church party,' of neither of whom Brown has a word to say, that 'the Bedford election' of 1774 was fiercely fought.' The two 'corporation candidates' opposed to Howard and Whitbread, the 'patriotic candidates,' were Sir William Wake and Robert Sparrow. An old inhabitant of Bedford, who remembered the election, told Brown that the zeal of one clergyman of the Established Church, a warm supporter of Howard and Whitbread, ran so high that he attempted to pour scorn upon Howard's opponent by shamelessly taking as his text S. Matthew x. 29 and 31, 'Are not two Sparrows sold for a farthing?' 'Fear ye not therefore; ye are of more value than many Sparrows.'

A Review of Hume and Huxley on Miracles. By Sir EDMUND BECKETT, Bart., LL.D., Q.C., F.R.A.S., Chancellor and Vicar-General of York. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.)

SOME old writer (we forget at this moment precisely who it was) is recorded to have said that 'the entire wisdom of the English law was devoted to the getting of twelve honest and credible men into a jury box.' The highest expression of legal wisdom would accordingly be a barrister's argument with intent to convince the 'twelve honest and credible men' in their box before him. Sir Edmund Beckett would seem to have been much of this mind. He has accepted a brief in favour of 'Miracles,' and Messrs. Hume and Huxley are the counsel 'on the other side;' and the entire *Review* which he has written is cast in great measure into the mould of a legal argument. Having, as Sir Edmund Beckett had, a very strong case in his brief, it need not surprise us that he brings out with great skill its overwhelming preponderance of probability in point after point, and deduces at length a triumphant demonstration of the untenableness of his adversary's theory. It would have been strange indeed had one so 'cunning in fence' done otherwise.

But, after all, the value of an argument, upon a subject so grave as this, depends upon its being effectual not only to silence but to convince an opponent. And we are afraid that occasionally the very cleverness of the dialectic would rather hinder than help this desirable result. Mr. Hume has left his famous argument for the invalidity of miracles to speak for itself without his living presence, and if he can hear he can certainly not reply to his assailant. But we anticipate some kind of a reply to Sir E. Beckett from Dr. Huxley, who is himself a pretty fencer too, and the combat will not be without its interest. We shall not attempt to anticipate the line of reply to be taken up, or point out where in our judgment Sir E. Beckett's plea is more brilliant than sound. It is a pleasant thing in any case to find a distinguished layman occupying himself with the defence of the Faith. If we do not think that the present essay will, for the reasons we have indicated, go down to posterity side by side with Lord Lyttelton's *Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of S. Paul*, which, although published in 1747, has not yet become altogether obsolete, the merit can hardly be denied to it of being technically irrefragable, though there may be other considerations to be brought forward in order to completeness of treatment of the subject, into which Sir E. Beckett has not travelled. They were not in his brief.

1. *Registres d'Innocent XI*, publiés par M. ELIE BERGER, Fascic. I.-V. *Registres de Benoit XI*, publiés par CH. GRANDJEAN, Fascic. I.; d'après les MSS. originaux du Vatican, etc. (Paris: Thorin, 1884.)
2. *Johannis Burchardi diarium, sive rerum urbanarum commentarii*. Edid. L. THUASNE. Vol. I. (Paris: Leroux, 1884.)

Now that, thanks to the enlightened liberality of Pope Leo XIII., the archives of the Vatican have been thrown open to students, we may hope that many an historical problem will be cleared up respecting which angry controversies were carried on not very long ago, and that the annals of the Church of Rome will be stripped of that veil of mystery which almost justified Protestants in concluding that where there was so much industriously concealed there could not but be many things unfit to see the light. The French school established in Rome by the Government of the Republic will have done much to bring about this result, and two of the important works we have to notice are due to distinguished members of that establishment. Let us notice, in the first place, the registers of Pope Innocent IV., the first volume of which has just been published, taking the reader to the month of May, 1248. The Pontificate of this energetic Churchman was principally occupied by his foreign policy, and especially by his quarrels with the Empire; the Bulls which he issued have, therefore, a special interest from that point of view, and they may serve as a comment on the whole course of his administration. M. Elie Berger is not the first *savant*, as we all know, who has had the idea of printing a Bullarium: the large work of Jaffé and Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum*, was issued some years ago. But at that time it was difficult to obtain access to the Vatican library, and still more to take copies of the documents there pre-

served. All these hindrances have now been removed, and for the reign of Innocent IV., at any rate, Jaffé and Potthast are quite superseded. The 8,600 Bulls printed, or analysed, by M. Berger, represent the first six years and the last three of the Pontificate; the documents belonging to the seventh are lost. Amongst those which are at our disposal a great number bearing upon the years 1243-1244 were never registered; they will not be found in M. Berger's volumes; the others are analysed either from Potthast's collection or from the originals. Extracts are frequently given, and in certain cases the document is printed *in extenso*. For a *recueil* of this kind, destined merely to be used as a work of reference, the quarto shape was preferable to the octavo; each page consists of two columns in small but very legible type, and a copious index will be given with the last volume.

The next series of Papal Bulls we have to notice takes us from Innocent IV. to Benedict XI. M. Grandjean, who is responsible for this new publication, intends giving also the *Regesta* of Boniface VIII., Benedict's immediate predecessor; but as the transcription of the documents pertaining to the latter of these Popes was ready first, he thought it best to send it immediately to press without regard to chronological sequence. If the Pontificate of Innocent IV. holds an important place in mediæval history, that of Benedict XI., despite its brief duration, is more interesting still. He had to settle many of the affairs left unfinished by the Pope who preceded him; his love of peace induced him to modify or even to cancel many rash decisions given by Caetan, as, for instance, the Bulls fulminated against the King of France, Philip the Fair; he also recalled the Colonna family, and restored to them their possessions. Benedict's correspondence with the kings of France, of Naples, and of Sicily occupies a great place in this collection. Political interests, as a matter of fact, absorbed nearly all his time, and constituted the principal feature of his brief Pontificate. We can easily imagine how interesting from this point of view will be the projected Bullarium of Boniface VIII., and we hope that it will soon be completed and sent to press. We have noticed that the number of Bulls printed *in extenso* is far larger in the *Regesta* of Benedict than in those of Innocent IV.; whether this is owing or not to the fact that the materials in the former case are much more limited in quantity is what we cannot say, but it is a decided improvement, and we trust that it may be continued throughout the whole of the collections. It would be impossible, of course, to pass a final judgment on the works of MM. Grandjean and Berger till we possess the introduction and the tables.

The first volume of Burchard's *Diarium*, published by M. Thuasne, is another work of the utmost importance for the history of the Papacy, and we are glad to see it edited at last in its integrity, for the text given by Eccard is extremely incorrect, and the one for which Gennarelli was responsible is mutilated. Most of our readers are aware that the reputation enjoyed by the *Diarium* was derived from its supposed scandalous character, and from the startling details

it was reported to give, especially on the court of Alexander VI. Those who are in quest of such things will be disappointed when they turn to the *Diarium* itself. Scandals there are, for Burchard, like an Italian Pepys or Dangeau, noted down everything which fell under his notice; but they constitute a relatively small element in the book, and the chief value of it consists in the particulars it supplies on the ceremonies of the Romish Church, the liturgy, the costumes, manners, and usages. Nor must we omit the historical details with which this first volume is full, the most important for us being an account of the audience given to the English ambassadors who came to thank the Pope for having permitted the marriage which put an end to the Wars of the Roses. Burchard seems to be honest enough; he does not aim higher than the humble position of a registrar who jots down whatever he observes, good, bad, and indifferent. We must also bear in mind that his *Diarium* was in no wise the official journal some persons imagine, kept as part of the duties belonging to his place. He compiled it merely for his own pleasure, and it was only at a later period that the masters of the ceremonies at the Vatican were obliged to assume the functions of annalists in addition to their ordinary functions. We cannot appreciate M. Thuasne's merits as an editor before the publication of his second volume, which is to contain a life of Burchard and a general estimate of his merits as an historian. We can only say, just now, that the portion before us is carefully done and elegantly printed. The MS. belonging to the Chigi Palace, and copied from the original by order of Pope Alexander VII., has served as the text; two other *codices* preserved at Florence, and three more forming part of the treasures of the Paris National Library, have been collated. The notes are, perhaps, too few, but the appendix, extending over eighty pages, and comprising upwards of fifty documents chiefly taken from the Florence archives, is extremely valuable. The epoch over which the present volume extends begins with December 23, 1483, and goes to the death of Pope Innocent VIII., July 25, 1492. M. Thuasne will soon, we trust, have brought to a conclusion his excellent work.

1. *La Bible française au moyen-âge; études sur les plus anciennes versions de la Bible, écrites en prose de la langue d'oïl.* Par SAMUEL BERGER. (Paris: Champion, 1884.)

THE origins and formation of the French Bible are a subject of which we need scarcely stop to prove the interest; whether we consider it in its relation with literature, exegesis or ecclesiastical history, it is equally important, and we cannot but welcome a work which, like that of M. Samuel Berger, treats it methodically and exhaustively. The French *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* had proposed as a subject for public competition an account of all the versions of the Bible in the *Langue d'oïl* anterior to the death of Charles V. The subject was a much wider one than appeared at first sight, for the French mediæval translations of the Bible which are of any value belong almost all to an epoch preceding the year 1380. Accordingly,

the task amounted to a survey, not of a few specimens of the French Scriptures, but of all the specimens known to exist in the principal libraries of Europe. The amount of preliminary investigation necessary for this work can easily be imagined, and it would have been absolutely impossible, if M. Berger had not been able to secure the co-operation of friends in the various museums to which he has had access. Then there was a comparison to be made between all these MSS., with the view of determining their origin, their date, their peculiarities of dialect; they might thus be reduced to a few well-defined families, and traced back to a common *principium et fons*. But, further, the critical study of the *Langue d'oïl* text, carefully conducted in a parallel manner with the different Latin versions, must elicit some curious statements as to these versions themselves. Of the three translations for which Saint Jerome is responsible, which was the one adopted by the French scholars? Such are a few only of the points to be settled if the subject is to be completely dealt with. Two or three incidental ones remain to be mentioned besides, and, in the first place, we must not forget the famous *Bible Historiale* of Guyard Desmoulins, imitated from the *Historia Scholastica* of Peter Comestor. Even supposing we leave aside, as M. Berger has been compelled to do, the innumerable histories of the Bible, moralized Bibles, etc., we cannot neglect the *Bible Historiale*. We have in it a translation from the Vulgate, and, further, it is under its cover, so to say, that the old thirteenth-century version earned its popularity. The rhymed, or rather metrical, renderings must be likewise mentioned. M. Berger has found himself obliged to omit them; but at the same time he has carried his studies to the frontier where prose and poetry meet, for, as he says, there are certain noteworthy affinities between both, and, in one instance, he has placed a rhymed psalter of the thirteenth century amongst some prose versions which belong to the same family.

The prize awarded to M. Berger cannot seem but thoroughly deserved to any *savant* who bestows the smallest amount of attention upon the book we are now reviewing. It often happens that the persons appointed to settle the terms of a competition do so somewhat at random, and without having studied accurately all the bearings of the subject. Such has been evidently the case in the present instance; but the result has been to prove to the most sceptical that the University of France has lost none of its reputation for sound and conscientious scholarship. Within the limits of a brief notice it is quite impossible to touch upon all the points discussed by M. Berger; two or three, however, must be briefly mentioned here. Let us, in the first place, single out the chapter on the Bible of the Waldenses. It is well known to all students of the Holy Scriptures that an extraordinary legend has gradually been formed about the literature of the early French Reformers, and that versions of the Bible have been ascribed to them with which they had nothing whatever to do. From these passages, easily accessible (*Anecdotes d'Etienne de Bourbon*, Walter Map *De nugis curialium*, the *Bullarium* of Pope Innocent III.), it seems quite evident that the

sacred books used by the Vaudois were neither a complete translation of the Bible, nor even a version of the New Testament, but certain detached portions of Scripture, generally accompanied by a commentary, bound together in one volume, and differing from one another both as to origin and to character. We know that in the city of Metz there existed towards the beginning of the thirteenth century a large congregation of Christians belonging to the sect of the Waldenses, and as the MS. of the work they used for purposes of edification is in the Arsenal Library at Paris, we can form a pretty accurate idea of what the sacred literature of the Vaudois really was.

Another very important topic is the *Bible Historiale* of Guyard Desmoulins. This book, so justly celebrated during the middle ages, is closely connected with the French Bible translated in the course of the thirteenth century, and which was the first really popular translation of the Scriptures anterior to the era of the Reformation. We may say, with M. Berger, that if the thirteenth-century version we are now alluding to enjoyed its reputation, it is merely or chiefly because it appeared under the wing, so to say, of Guyard Desmoulins. The *Bible Historiale*, written in imitation of Peter Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*, must not be regarded as a translation of it; the Dean of Aire merely took as a pattern one of the most widely-spread treatises of the day, and even his labours were not deemed sufficient, for we find the *Bible Historiale*, composed in the dialect of Picardy, subsequently supplemented by additions which are the work of a Parisian author. This special chapter is extremely interesting, and must have cost M. Berger an immense amount of labour; it contains a classification and description of all the known MSS. of the *Bible Historiale* in its complete form.

The last topic we shall mention here is the importance which the French version of the Bible had in mediæval society: what part did it play at the family fire-side, in the literary world, in the Church? With this question are closely connected several others—namely, who were the artists (copyists, miniaturists, etc.), who helped to diffuse the Scriptures? What is the approximate number of MSS. known? What noble families ordered these MSS. to be made? etc., etc. All these curious particulars are treated of in succession by M. Berger, who terminates his volume by giving, if we may thus express ourselves, the genealogy of modern French versions, Olivétan being derived from Lefèvre d'Étaples, who, in his turn, worked upon a copy of Jean de Rély's Bible.

We are now reluctantly obliged to dismiss with this brief and incomplete summary a work which, from whatever point of view we examine it, should hold a distinguished place in the library of every student of the Holy Scriptures.

Modern Physics. By ERNEST NAVILLE, Corresponding Member of the Institute. Translated by Henry Downton, M.A., formerly English Chaplain at Geneva. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1883.)

THIS work is of a kind which is very rare in England, and perhaps little suited to the present habits of English thought. It is, as the

author expresses it, 'a study of science, historical and philosophical.' It contains neither original research nor a mere description of facts, but rather a view of the bases on which science rests, the mode in which it has been developed, and the lines along which it should be guided. It takes the form of five separate but connected essays. The first is on the distinctive characters of modern physics, which it enumerates as follows: (1) mechanical nature of the phenomena; (2) unity of matter; (3) transformations of motions; (4) conservation of energy; (5) mathematical explanation of the phenomena. This essay is on the whole a correct and able sketch of the modern view which represents the universe as a collection of particles—practically centres of force—which are perpetually acting upon and moving each other, but without any power of moving themselves. It is not, however, quite clear in all its parts; for instance, the statement on p. 7 that 'in the whole material universe there is nothing else than motion' is in itself likely to mislead, although it is corrected subsequently by full admission of the principle that where there is motion there must be something which moves. If this and a few similar blemishes were corrected, the sketch would be of great value to anyone desiring to know what are the fundamental conceptions of modern physics and what are the aims which it now has before it.

The second essay is on the origin of modern physics, and is chiefly occupied in re-establishing the claim of Descartes to be regarded as the true founder of modern physical theories. Bacon, M. Naville considers, did great service in pointing out the need of reform in scientific method and the brilliant consequences which would ensue from it, but his conception of the lines on which the movement was to proceed were essentially faulty. On the other hand, Descartes, by overturning the old notion of substantial forms, by insisting on the truth of our conceptions of nature, when clear and distinct, by teaching the essential unity of matter with its three leading properties of form, size, and motion, and lastly by establishing the distinction, still continually forgotten, between heat, for instance, considered as a sensation in us and heat considered as a property in bodies which may cause such sensations, fairly started science on the road which it has followed with such extraordinary success. In fact the laws of motion, which in the hands of Newton became the basis of mechanics and then of physics generally, were really laid down by Descartes. At the same time the author fully recognizes the errors of detail into which that great discoverer fell, and the way in which these obscured and for a time eclipsed the true and noble principles which he had established.

In Essay III. the guiding principles of physics are laid down as follows:—(1) Causality: all that is produced has a cause. (2) Constancy: the universe is composed of elements, the properties of which are fixed. (3) Simplicity: the number of causes should be reduced as far as possible. (4) Harmony: nothing is isolated; the different classes of beings and the different laws which govern them are in constant relation to each other. (5) Inertia: matter is a force, since it occupies space, but the elements of matter have no sponta-

neity, no power to modify their own proper motion. These, as the author indeed admits, are rather (except the last) guiding principles than actual foundations, postulates in the science of nature rather than axioms. They are not necessary, or capable of actual demonstration by experiment. They are therefore comparable with other guiding principles which may be used and have been used in the advance of knowledge, viz. our fundamental beliefs concerning God considered as the first cause of the universe. The most original and interesting part of the book is that in which the author shows how a belief in God has forwarded the march of these principles and of the science deduced from them, and how a want of such belief has obscured and impeded their recognition. In an age when science and faith are talked of as incompatible it was well to point out how the great initiators and founders of modern physical science—Copernicus, Kepler, Bacon, Descartes, Galileo, Newton, Leibnitz, Ampère, Liebig, Fresnel, Faraday, Mayer, Heer, De la Rive, Choiseul, Wurtz—were all men of a deep and sincere religious belief.

In the fourth essay, on 'Physics and Morals,' a clear distinction is drawn between physical and psychical phenomena. The question is also discussed how far the modern principle of the conservation of energy really lends support to pure materialism. It is pointed out (1) that we have no right to assume the conservation of energy to hold of mental phenomena; (2) that this principle, assuming it to hold, may be reconciled with the power of the will by supposing the latter to act in changing the *direction* of the forces but not their *amount*.

In Essay V. the scientific spirit of modern physics is compared with scepticism and rationalism, and the work concludes with a brief but valuable criticism of the doctrine of evolution as being of great value and promise in itself, and at the same time perfectly compatible with the other doctrine of creation.

On the whole we may fairly commend this book to all those—would they were more numerous—who care not for science alone, nor for religion alone, but for both alike, and for both as coming from the same Author. We can also commend the rendering as clear and terse in style; but we must express our regret at what we can only call most inexcusable neglect on the part of the translator. Mr. Downton appears to know little or nothing himself of mechanics, or he could not have translated *forces vives* by 'live force.' But, further, he knows so little even of the most renowned literature of his own country that we find in the notes references not only to *La Chaleur considérée comme une Mode du Mouvement*, by Tyndall, but even to *Les Principes* of Newton and *La Sagesse des Anciens* of Francis Bacon. Does he really believe that these authors wrote in French? In the same spirit he quietly remarks that in quotations from English authors he contents himself with retranslating from the French versions, and thus Tyndall's well-known 'promise and potency' of life as referring to matter appears here as the 'dawn and the power.' If Mr. Downton was himself unable to clear up these points he might surely have found a friend to do so. His neglect simply

offers a handle for unsparing ridicule to any hostile critic into whose hands the work may fall.

Good the Final Goal of Ill. Four Letters to the Ven. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. By a Layman. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1883.)

THIS little work is meant to be an argument from the side of science and nature in support of Archdeacon Farrar's well-known views on eschatology. It is written with much earnestness and moderation, and with an almost deference to the opinions of professed theologians, but even from its own point of view it can hardly be said to be satisfactory. Throughout the first three letters it is very difficult to see what the writer's drift really is. The most interesting point of them is that in which (p. 62) he insists on the almost complete happiness of the brute creation, as opposed to those pessimists who regard their condition as uniformly miserable. Anything which throws light on what is perhaps the darkest part of God's dealings with the world is welcome, and the writer urges his view with skill and power. Still the reader cannot help asking himself, 'What has this to do with eternal punishment?' Apparently the argument is that if God does so much for the happiness of the lower creatures He will surely be slow to condemn to eternal misery a large part, at any rate, of mankind. But the 'orthodox' answer is surely complete in one sentence: 'The lower creatures have not sinned.' Nor is the argument more cogent (p. 25) that we are not bound to take 'eternal punishment' literally, because we have ceased to regard the word 'day' in Genesis i. as a literal period of twenty-four hours. If we take eternal to mean 'infinitely long' the difficulty before the Universalist is to show that an inspired writer could use this word, meaning it to be taken in the sense of 'long but finite'—that is, in the sense *opposite* to that which it literally expresses. This is a very different thing from using the same word 'day' to signify two different but limited periods of time. So in English it would be easy to show that a writer speaking of 'darkness,' for instance, did not necessarily imply utter absence of light, but it would be hard to convince us that he really meant broad daylight.

NEW EDITIONS, SERMONS, PAMPHLETS, ETC.

All who have found out by practice the value of Dr. Young's *Analytical Concordance* will welcome his recently published *Concordance to the Greek New Testament* (Edinburgh: G. A. Young and Co., 1884). Its specialty is the addition of the Hebrew words represented by the Greek words that are common to the LXX and the New Testament.

Bishop Barry's *Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey* (Cassell, 1884) is a valuable legacy from one whom the Church at home can ill spare. The Sixth Sermon, on Christianity and Art, contains an eloquent acknowledgment of the architectural glories of the abbey in which it was preached.

Messrs. Rivington have published *Selections from the Writings of*

K K 2

John Mason Neale, by the same compiler who has prepared Selections from Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, and Dr. Liddon. It is a fascinating book, with extracts from that brilliant and versatile writer's hymns and poems and sermons and essays and tales.

Dr. Scrivener's *Authorized Edition of the English Bible* (Cambridge : University Press, 1884) is an enlarged and corrected edition of the learned author's Introduction to the Cambridge Paragraph Bible of 1873. As a critical edition of the Authorized Version of 1611, this volume simply exhausts the subject.

Harriet Monsell: a Memoir, by Canon Carter (Masters, 1884), will be prized, not only by those who had the privilege of personal acquaintance with the First Mother Superior of the Clewer community, but by all who can admire a saintly and useful life. Those, if any there be, who do not know what the English Sisterhoods, and especially that of S. John Baptist, have done for the Church, had better read this modest but most instructive biography.

We notice among pamphlets the Bishop of Lincoln's *Christian Womanhood and Christian Sovereignty* (Rivingtons); an excellent paper entitled *True Temperance as taught by the Bible* (Rivingtons), by Miss Austen Leigh, in which she argues against the exaggerated assertions of fanatical total abstainers; and an essay on *Sobriety* (Rivingtons), by the Rev. C. L. Coghlan, on the same lines; also Prebendary Meyrick's *Baptism, Regeneration, Conversion* (S.P.C.K.).

That most telling and useful book, *The Dead Hand in the Free Churches of Dissent* (Walter Smith), has gone into an abridged, revised, and cheaper edition.

Christian Opinion on Usury (Macmillan), by the Rev. W. Cunningham, of Trinity College, Cambridge, is a very able essay, giving a comprehensive view of the subject in its relation to canon law, and remarkable for a (perhaps) too sweeping censure of the Jews. It deserves careful study.

We can warmly commend the *Brief Historical Catechism concerning Ireland and her Church* (Dublin : Charles and Son). It has reached a third edition.

We mentioned in our last Number (p. 254) that Dr. Harnack had complained in his *Theologische Literaturzeitung* of the treatment which some of his articles in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie* had received in the process of adapting them for the *Religious Encyclopædia* then in course of publication in New York. Dr. Philip Schaff, the editor of the latter work, is aggrieved that we noticed Dr. Harnack's remonstrance without further stating that, in a subsequent number of the German periodical, he himself had been allowed to vindicate his own action in the matter. But Dr. Harnack, while admitting Dr. Schaff's rejoinder, declares himself not satisfied with the explanation. We have ourselves more than once spoken favourably of Dr. Schaff's undertaking on its own merits, without reference to this controversy.

Erratum on p. 155 of this volume. In line 34 for 'inferior' read 'superior.'

INDEX TO VOL. XVIII.

ABB

- A** BBO of Fleury on a 'reading' in the *Te Deum.*, 9
- Alexander, Dr., first Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem: terms of the Royal Warrant for his consecration, 334; his reception at Jerusalem, 336; the 'schism of Hasbeyah,' 337
- 'Alelulia,' the: its use forbidden in Lent, 241
- Alms and Oblations, the application of the words in the Offertory Prayer, 66 *sqq.*; variant readings of the side-rubric regarding the absence of either alms or oblations, 68; difference in Scriptural language between oblation and sacrifice, 70; use in old Liturgies, 71 *sq.*; in the Scottish Liturgy, 72 *n.*; Lutheran notions, 73; the 'Mass penny,' 75; treatment of the Oblations in the First Book, 76; in the Second, 77; our present Liturgy, 78 *sq.*; Dr. Howson on 'present and place,' 81; the Savoy Liturgy, 82; Bishop Cosin's suggestion, 83; the repugnance to the word 'sacrifice,' 85; sacrificial worship the only worship known to the Bible, 87
- Anglican Bishops in Jerusalem, the Three, 326 *sqq.*
- Animal Intelligence, 289 *sqq.*
- Archbishop Boniface's Constitution on the appointment of parish clerks, 30
- Archæology: difficulty of its study in Turkish dominions, 117
- Arnold, Mr. Matthew, *Isaiah of Jerusalem*, 208

BAR

- Arnold, Mr. T. (and Addis, Rev. W. E.), *A Catholic Dictionary*, 255
- Arthur, Mr. W., *On the Difference between Physical and Moral Law*, 246
- Ascham, on the state of studies at Cambridge, 272; on Edward VI., 279; his eulogies on the linguistic knowledge possessed by Queen Elizabeth, 280
- 'Association for the Furtherance of Christianity in Egypt,' 150; notice of its Report, 155
- Athanasian Creed, the: criticism of a pamphlet against its recital, 372 *sqq.*; exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, 378 *sqq.*; of the Incarnation: the Divine Personality of Christ, 383 *sqq.*; of the minatory propositions of the Creed, 385 *sqq.*; 'involuntary ignorance,' 389; the suggested compromise, 391; Mr. Ommanney's pamphlet on *The S.P.C.K. and the Creed of Saint Athanasius*, 393 *sqq.*; the history of the Creed, 394 *sq.*
- Atheism (modern), the true causes of, and the way to meet it, 433
- B**ALAAM and Balak: sites in Palestine connected with their history, 122
- Barclay, Dr., third Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, 340 *sqq.*; his knowledge of Rabbinical Hebrew, 341; incidents of his life, 342;

BEC

- brief tenure of the see, 344; statistics of the Mission, *ib.*
 Beckett, Sir E., *A Review of Hume and Huxley on Miracles*, 491
 Berger, Mons. E., *Registres d'Innocent XI*, 492
 Berger, Mons. S., *La Bible française au moyen âge*, 494
 Blackley, Canon: his proposed method of National Insurance, 196 *sqq.*
 Bouchier, Cardinal: sketch of his early life and character, 175; appointed Bishop of Ely, 176; reasons for his elevation to Canterbury, 177; state of the morals of the clergy, 179; Gascoigne's *Seven Streams of Babylon*, 180; difficult political position of the Primate, 181; elevation to the Cardinalate, *ib.*; receives as a guest at Canterbury the Maronite Patriarch, 183; patronizes Caxton, *ib.*; further political difficulties, 184; his relations with Richard III., 185; his character, 187
 Brace, Mr. C. Loring, *Gesta Christi*, 345 *sqq.*
 Brooks, Rev. Phillips, *Sermons preached in English Churches*, 231
 Bryennius (Metropolitan of Nicomedia), *Διδαχή τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων*, 213 *sqq.*
 Bunsen, the chief originator of the Jerusalem bishopric scheme, 329 *sq.*
 Burgon, Dean, *The Revision Revised*, 219

CAIRNS in Palestine, mostly modern, 125

- Calpurnius, Matthew, taught Greek pronunciation at Oxford, 259
 Chester, Dean of: his interpretation of 'Oblations' in the Offertory Prayer, 66 *sqq.*; his essay *Before the Table*, noticed, 69, 80 *n.*
 Christianity, benefits wrought by, 345 *sqq.*

COO

- Christianity in Egypt, 149 *sqq.*; the Association for the Furtherance of Christianity in Egypt, 150; 'Melchites' and 'Jacobites': their theological tenets, 152 *sqq.*; the work of the Association, 155; letter from the Patriarch Sophronios, 156; Coptic Schools in Cairo, 158; character of the clergy, *ib.*; hopeful prospects, 160, *sq.*
 Church's part in education, the, 352
 Church in Old London, the: evidence as to its condition at an early period, 357; helps to knowledge afforded by topography, 358; probably one great 'All Saints' parish, 359; epochs of successive changes, 361; strange epithets of persons, soon turned into surnames, 362; S. Martin Orgar's 'le Proud,' 363; subdivision of large parishes, 365; married priests, 367; the canons and the prebendal manors of S. Paul's, 368 *sq.*; the sale of slaves, 369; the 'firmarius,' *ib.*; the 'College' of S. Martin-le-Grand, 370; the monastic churches of London, 371; cause of the smallness of most London churches, *ib.*
 Convent education of girls, 130 *sqq.*; Protestant girls educated in Roman Catholic convents in the United States and in France, 131; development of teaching in Anglican sisterhoods, *ib.*; convent education appraised, 133 *sqq.*; influence of the Jesuit methods of instruction in the modern Latin Church, 136; Aquaviva's *Ratio Studiorum*, 137; the pernicious character of French fiction, 138; religion in French and Italian households, 139; the rules of the institute of the Sacré Cœur, 141; Mgr. Dupanloup's account of the outcome of this system, 143 *sq.*; convent education in England and Ireland, 144 *sq.*
 Cook, Rev. Canon, *The Origins of Religion and Language*, 396 *sqq.*

CON

- Conder, Capt., *Heth and Moab*, 116 *sqq.*
 Coptic Church, the, 151; 'Melchites' and 'Jacobites,' 152; their theological opinions, 153
 Cotterill, Bishop, *Revealed Religion expounded by its Relations to the Moral Being of God*, 431 *sqq.*
 Cotterill, Mr. J. M., *Modern Criticism and Clement's Epistles to Virgins*, 478
 Credence-table, a foreign name, 81 n.
 Curci, Padre, *Il Vaticano Regio, tarlo superstite della Chiesa Cattolica*, 217
 Curfew-bell, bequests providing for the ringing of the, 39

- DARWIN'S book on earth-worms, noticed, 291; the *Descent of Man*, 293
 Denton, Rev. W., *The Ancient Church of Egypt*, 149
 Dhombre, Mons. M., *Etude sur la pensée religieuse de Michel Ange*, 253
 'Disc-stones' in Palestine, 125
 Dolmens and menhirs in Palestine, 125 *sqq.*
 Doyle, Sir F. H., amusing anecdote by, 339 n.

- EDERSHEIM, Rev. A., *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, 223
 Education of girls, principles to be observed in the, 133 *sqq.*
 Edward VI.: his proficiency in the study of Greek, 279
 Elizabeth, Queen: her linguistic attainments, 280
 Erasmus, on the study of Greek, 263; his description of Oxford students, 264; at Cambridge, 265
 Eton, the early study of Greek at, 261

GRE

- FAMAGOUSTA, cathedral of, 255
 Farini, *The Roman State*, 46 *sqq.*
 Farrar, Archdeacon: his Commentaries on Judges, and on 1 Corinthians, criticized, 205 *sq.*, 207
 Fergusson, Mr., *Rude Stone Monuments*, 124
 Friendly Societies, Report of the Convocation Committee on, 188 *sqq.*; criticisms, 189 *sq.*; Sick Benefit Societies and Deposit Societies, compared, 191 *sqq.*; the Abbott's Ann Society, 194; Canon Blackley's proposal of National Insurance, 197; hasty adoption of new methods deprecated, 198
 Fuller's account of the study of Greek at Oxford and Cambridge, 265

- GALTON, Mr. F., *Inquiries into Human Faculty and its Development*, 242
 Gascoigne's *Seven Streams of Babylon*, quoted, 180
 Gilead, description of the beautiful natural scenery of, 115
 Girls, the education of, 133 *sqq.*
 Gladstone, Mr., on the Jerusalem bishopric, 332
 Gloucester and Bristol, Bishop of, *An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers*, vols. i. and ii., 203; vol. iii. 466
 Gobat, Dr., second Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, 337; protests made against his consecration, and against his action in his see, 338; his policy of proselytizing, 339; statistics of his flock, 340
 Göblan (head of the anti-Turkish party in Moab), description of, 117; aids the workers of the Palestine Exploration Fund, 118
Good the Final Goal of Ill: Four Letters to Archdeacon Farrar, 499
 Green, Rev. J. R., *The Conquest of England*, 247
 Greek and Syrian Christians, po-

GRE

- sition of, in regard to the Anglican bishopric of Jerusalem, 338 *n*
- Greek, the English Reformation and the study of, 257 *sqq.*; early Greek scholars mentioned by Leland, 258; the first Professor of Greek at Oxford, 259; Cardinal Wolsey on the study of Greek, 261; S. Paul's boys' skill in the language, 261 *n.*; antipathy to the 'new learning' in Mary's reign, 263; Sir Thomas More's defence of Greek, 264; Greek at Cambridge, 265; Erasmus as Lady Margaret Lecturer, 266; Richard Croke, 268; Greek at Westminster and Merchant Taylors' Schools, 269 *n.*; disputes on the pronunciation of Greek, 270 *sq.*; the state of Cambridge and Oxford studies in 1550, compared, 272 *sqq.*; spoliation of MSS. and books, 274, 276; schools connected with monasteries, 276; English refugee scholars at Geneva, 277; revival of learning in the reigns of Elizabeth and Edward VI., 278; learned ladies of that time, 280 *sq.*
- Gregory XVI., Pope: his reign, 48 *sq.*
- HEBREW letters, the first printed in England, 269 *n.*
- Henry VIII. encouraged the study of Greek, 264
- Hittites: Capt. Conder's researches on their land, 127
- Hook, Dr., defended the foundation of the Jerusalem bishopric, 332
- Human progress under Christianity, 345 *sqq.*; the work of Christianity in the Roman world, 348; the *patria potestas*, 349; the *Treuga Dei*, 350; achievements of mediæval Christianity, 351; in equity and law, 352; the Church's part in education, *ib.*; the position of women, 353; results of non-Christian creeds appraised, 354.
- Huntingford, Dr., *Parable of the Lock and Key*, 256

LAU

- Hymnology, English, 89; rise and progress of a correct hymnody, 90; translations of Parisian Breviary Hymns, 91; various compilations of Hymns since 1838, *ib.*; *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, criticized, 92 *sqq.*; the emotional element in hymns, 95 *sqq.*; the *Church Hymns* of the S. P. C. K., 98 *sqq.*; the Hymnary of the Revs. Canon Cooke and Prebendary Webb, 101; the Rev. E. H. Bickersteth's *Hymnal Companion to the Book of Common Prayer*, 103; the *Westminster Abbey Hymn Book*, 103; hymns by Dean Stanley, 106 *sqq.*
- Hymns anciently used in the Eucharistic Service at the Preface, 20
- INSTITUTE of Charity: account of the foundation of the, 53 *sqq.*
- Irons, Dr., *Psalms and Hymns for the Church*, 255
- JERUSALEM, the Anglican see of: sketch of its foundation and history, 326 *sqq.*
- Jordan Valley Canal, the proposed scheme of the, 129
- KADESH; Capt. Conder's investigations as to the site of, 127 *sqq.*
- LADD, Dr. G. T., *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, 229
- Latin, change in the pronunciation of, brought about by the Reformation in England, 271 *n.*; Milton was adverse to this, 272 *n.*
- Laud, Archbishop, on the oblation of the elements in the Scottish Liturgy, 72 *n.*
- Lauder Lindsay, Dr., *Mind in the Lower Animals*, 294 *sqq.*

LAY

- Lay Folks' Mass-Book*, quoted in reference to the oblations, 75
 Learned ladies of the sixteenth century, 281
 Lias, Rev. J. J., *The Atonement viewed in the Light of Certain Modern Difficulties*, 480
 Liddon, Rev. Canon; his edition of Rosmini's *Five Wounds of the Holy Church*, 43 *sqq.*; his sermon on Dr. Pusey, 256; on the Athanasian Creed, 391
 Linacre, early Professor of Greek at Oxford, 250
 Lincoln, Bishop of, *On the Proposed Court of Final Appeal*, 199; *Conjectural Emendations in Ancient Authors*, 255
 Lutheran Church, the (Prussian), and Anglican ordinations, 334 *n.*
 Lyte, Mr. Maxwell, *Ninth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 361

MACWALTER, Mr., *Life of Antonio Rosmini Serbati*, 43 *sqq.*

- Map, Walter, on the marriage of the clergy, 367
 Mary, Queen: had some tincture of scholarship, 279
 M'Caul, Dr., his connexion with the Jerusalem bishopric scheme, 335
 Medd, Rev. P. G., *The One Mediator* (the Bampton Lecture for 1882), 233
 Mind in animals, the study of, 283 *sqq.*; pleasing results from comparative psychology, 285; inferences from analogy in lower orders of creation, 286; tear-shedding animals, 287; expression in animals, 288; the Criterion of Mind, 289; the 'raw material of consciousness,' 290; instinct in earthworms, 291; memory, 292; snails, 293; proneness to alcoholic inebriation in some animals, 295; mental disorders and illusions in animals, 296; remarkable story about bees, 297; mental evolution put

PAL

- forward as the corollary of organic evolution, 299
 Moab, topography of, 116
 Monuments discovered in the trans-Jordanic district, 126
 Morrison, Dr. James, *A Practical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew*, 209
 Mount Nebo, description of the panorama from, 121
 Mulford, Dr. E., *The Republic of God*, 227

NAMES, origin of some strange forms of, 362

- Naville, Mons. E., *Modern Physics*, 496
 New Editions, &c., 255, 500
 Newman, Cardinal, on religious emotion, 96; his hymns noticed, 96 *sq.*; his action in regard to the Jerusalem bishopric, 333; on the Holy Trinity, 378 *sq.*; on the Athanasian Creed, 392
 Nikosia, cathedral of, 255

OLIPHANT, Mr. Laurence: his scheme for a colony of Jews in Gilead, 129

Ommanney, Rev. G. D. W., *The S.P.C. and the Creed of Saint Athanasius*, 393 *sqq.*

Origins of religion and language, the, 396 *sqq.*; the Vedic and Zoroastrian systems, 398; comparative spirituality of the older conceptions of Deity, 400; Aryan, Semitic, and Turanian groups of nations, 401 *sqq.*; Persian religion, 405; the idea of hell, 406; Biblical and non-Biblical beliefs, 407; Egyptology, 408 *sq.*; universality of a belief in a Personal Supreme Being, 410 *sq.*

PALESTINE Exploration Fund: its work east of the Jordan, 114

PAR •

Parish Clerks: the origin of their office, 28; union of the functions of the 'poor clerks' and the 'aquæbajulus,' 29; 'Constitutions' and Canons on the election of parish clerks, 30; their various duties as choir-leaders, bell-ringers, &c., 31; penalties for their misdemeanours, 32 *sq.*; their rights and fees, 33 *sq.*; contest (17th century) about their legal position, 35; the Victorian statute 'for Regulating the office of Lecturers and Parish Clerks,' 37; guild of parish clerks formed in 1232, *ib.*; the 'Fellowship of Parish Clerks' in the metropolis, 38 *sq.*; poets and parish clerks, 40 *sq.*; Martin Scriblerus, 41; parish clerks in music and art, 42

Parishes, subdivision of, in Old London, 365

Patrick, Bishop, on the 'Objections,' 67, 84

Pereira, Rev. W. H., *A Commentary on the Office for the Ministration of Holy Baptism*, 482

Petrine claims, the: the legal flaws in the later Papacy, 437 *sqq.*; effects of unlawful possession of the Papal Chair, 439; forcible intrusion, 441; simony and heresy, 442 *sqq.*; secret heresy, 445; apostate Popes, 446 *n.*; Pope Honorius I. and Monothelism, 447 *sqq.*; image-worship, 450; Pope Formosus, 453; intruding Popes of the eleventh century, 456; the Popes at Avignon, 458; the Great Schism, 459; Alexander VI., 461; Ultramontane plea in defence, 462; Table of Popes disqualified by irregularities, 464 *sq.*

Phonetic spelling of English advocated in the sixteenth century, 271 *n.*

Pisgah (of Balaam and Moses): attempts to fix its site, 120

Pott, Mr., *The Hymn 'Te Deum laudamus'*, 486

Prayer - Book enrichment in America, 161 *sqq.*; a desire for

ROS

special offices, 162 *sq.*: wants that can be immediately supplied, 165; prayers for individual communicants suggested, 167; the Eucharistic office, 167 *sqq.*; Introits, the 'Prophecy,' 170; defects in the American Prayer-Book rubrics, 172; the Sunday and Festival Collects, 173; the excision of Black-Letter Saints' Days, 173 *n.*; suggested improvements in the Epistles and Gospels, 174; in the Daily and Occasional Services, 413 *sqq.*; the Lectionary, 414; Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, 415; the Lord's Prayer, 417; the Canticles, 418; the Litany, 421; the Occasional Services, 424; Baptism, Marriage, Confirmation, &c., 426 *sqq.*; Pontifical Offices, 428

Prescott, Rev. Dr., *Christian Hymns and Hymn-Writers*, 240

RENOUF'S *Egyptian Grammar*, 408 *sq.*; his *Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, cited, 444

Réville, Mons. A., *Les religions des peuples non-civilisés*, 521

Richard III.: his relations with Cardinal Bourchier, 184 *sqq.*

Richey, Rev. Dr., *The Nicene Creed and the Filioque*, 483

Rivarola, Cardinal (Leo XII.'s Minister): his system of government, 48

Rogers, Prof. J. E. T., *Loci e Libro Veritatum*, 175

Romanes, Mr. G. J., *Animal Intelligence*, criticized, 289 *sqq.*

Rosmini's *Five Wounds of the Holy Church*, 43 *sqq.*; characteristics of the work, 44; circumstances of its composition and publication, 45 *sq.*; reign of Gregory XVI., 46; government by clerics, 47; Leo XII.'s government, 48; Rosmini's political views, 49; accession of Pius IX., *ib.*; sketch of Rosmini's life, 50 *sqq.*; the Institute of Charity, 53; works of Rosmini placed on the Index, 54 *sq.*; the value of the

SAD

Cinque Piaghe, 56; summary of its purport, 57 *sqq.*; division between people and clergy in public worship, 59; education of the clergy, 61; disunion of Bishops, 65

SADLER, Rev. M. F., *The Gospel according to S. John*, 467

Schaff, Dr. P., *A Popular Commentary on the New Testament*, vol. iv., 212; *A Religious Encyclopædia*, vol. iii., 485

Scudamore, Mr., on the 'Oblations,' 71 *sq.*

Simmons, Rev. Canon: his interpretation of 'Oblations' in the Offertory Prayer, 67, 70 *n.*, 81, 84

Sisterhoods: their work in the education of girls, 131 *sqq.*

Skelton, the poet's, 'aquæbajulus' (parish clerk), 29

Skinner, James, Memoir of, 301 *sqq.*; the Skinner family, 302; school and early clerical life of James Skinner, 303; Chaplain to the Forces, 304; at S. Barnabas', Pimlico, 306; the English Church Union, 307; Mr. Skinner as Warden of the Beauchamp Almshouses, 308; his ill-health, 309 *sqq.*; his relations with Dr. Pusey, 311; his death, 312; his writings and theological opinions, 313 *sqq.*; on the reception of Holy Communion fasting, 316; early Communion, 317 *sq.*; the externals of divine worship, 319; advice to the morbidly scrupulous, 321; on the expression 'different Churches,' 322; on the Roman claims, 323; visit to Dr. Döllinger, 324

Slavery and the slave-trade, as affected by Christianity, 353

Statuta et Consuetudines Eccl. Sarisberiensis, ed. E. A. Dayman and W. H. Rich Jones, 250

Stone monuments of Moab, the, 123

Stoughton, Rev. Dr., *Howard the Philanthropist and his Friends*, 489

WAT

Swainson, Rev. Dr., *The Greek Liturgies*, 469

TABLE of Popes disqualified by irregularities, 464 *sq.*

Te Deum, the: its antiquity, 1; attributed to SS. Ambrose and Augustine, 2; to S. Hilary of Poitiers, and to others, 4; MSS. containing it, 4 *sqq.*; early references to it, 7; the latest and the earliest dates for its composition, 9 *sq.*; its *textus receptus* and various readings, 11 *sqq.*; the sources of its contents, 15; connexion with the Eucharistic Preface, 16; parallelisms in ancient Sacramentaries, 17 *sqq.*; verses taken from S. Jerome's version, 21 *sqq.*; verses omitted in some MSS., 24; conclusion as to place and date of its origin, 25 *sqq.*; Merati's conclusion as to its author, 27

Theologische Literaturzeitung, 254
Theology as a Science, 431; the true office of theology, 432; the weaknesses of current theology, 433; Bishop Cotterill's work on *Revealed Religion*, reviewed, 434 *sqq.*

Thuasne, Mons. L., *Joannis Burchardi diarium*, 492

Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Græce*, 475

Trans-Jordanic Palestine: some account of the survey of the Palestine Exploration Fund, 111-130

Trevor, Rev. Canon, on 'Before the Table,' 69

VARIOUS Hymn-Books noticed, 91 *sqq.*

Vetus Registrum Sarisberiense, ed. W. H. Rich Jones, 250

WATSON, Rev. F., *The Law and the Prophets* (the Hulsean Lectures for 1882), 235

WEI

- Weiss, Dr. Bernhard, *The Life of Christ*, 226
 Western Palestine, a geological expedition engaged in the examination of, 129
 Whitelaw, Rev. T., *How is the Divinity of Jesus depicted in the Gospels and Epistles?* 488
 Wilberforce, Bishop, on the Jerusalem bishopric, 331
 Wilson, Prebendary A., *Celebration of Holy Communion on Good Friday, &c.*, 256

WRI

- Wilson, Rev. J. M., *The Theory of Inspiration*, 238
 Wolsey, Cardinal, founded a Professorship of Greek at Oxford, 260
 Wood, Hon. C. L., on the Report of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, 199
 Women : the improvement in their position wrought by Christianity, 347
 Wright, Mr. W. Aldis, *The Bible Word-Book*, 255

LONDON : PRINTED BY
 SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
 AND PARLIAMENT STREET

theory of

a Pro-
Oxford,

Report
Ecclesi-

in their
tianity,

e Bible